



THE
ANDOVER REVIEW

VOLUME XVII.—PUBLISHED MONTHLY.—NUMBER CII.

JUNE, 1892

CONTENTS

Das Public Library 92*?

1. MORALITY: WHAT IS BETTER? <i>Amory H. Bradford, D. D.</i>	
2. LEADERS OF WIDENING CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT. II. JOHN MCLEOD CAMPBELL. <i>Miss Agnes Maule Machar</i>	
3. AN ORGANIZED REVIVAL AMONG THE YOUNG. <i>Francis E. Clark, D. D.</i>	573
4. REALITY IN THE PULPIT. <i>Rev. Charles H. Cutler</i>	580
5. THE GREEK QUESTION AT CAMBRIDGE. <i>Frank G. Moore, Ph. D.</i>	589
6. EDITORIAL.	
THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST. II. THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH	598
THE ROMAN CATHOLIC POLICY CONCERNING POPULAR EDUCATION	606
SOCIAL LEGISLATION; THE NEW DANISH POOR-LAW.—BELGIAN COUNCILS OF ARBITRATION	609
DR. STORRS'S ULTIMATUM	613
7. BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM. MARK XVI. 9-20, AND JOHN VII. 53.—VIII. 11. <i>A. P. Peabody, D. D., LL. D.</i>	631
8. BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.	
Henry's Patrick Henry, 638. — Winsor's Christopher Columbus, 640.	
9. BOOKS RECEIVED	644

BOSTON
HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY
NEW YORK: 11 EAST SEVENTEENTH STREET
The Riverside Press, Cambridge
LONDON: WARD, LOCK, BOWDEN & CO., WARWICK HOUSE, SALISBURY SQUARE

Entered at the Post Office at Boston as second-class matter
TERMS—SINGLE NUMBERS, 35 CENTS
YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, \$4.00

Why is it that Strictly Pure White Lead is the Best Paint?

Because it will outlast all other Paints, make a handsomer finish, give better protection to the wood, and the first cost will be less.

If a color other than white is wanted, tint the paint with the National Lead Co.'s

Pure White Lead Tinting Colors

These colors are sold in small cans, one pound being sufficient to tint twenty-five pounds of pure White Lead the desired shade.

Be Careful

to use only old and well-known brands of white lead. The market is flooded with adulterated and "so-called" white leads. The following brands are always strictly pure and are established by the test of years:

"ANCHOR" (Cincinnati)
"ARMSTRONG & McKELVY" (Pittsburgh)
"ATLANTIC" (New York)
"BEYMER-BAUMAN" (Pittsburgh)
"BRADLEY" (New York)
"BROOKLYN" (New York)
"COLLIER" (St. Louis)
"CORNELL" (Buffalo)
"DAVIS-CHAMBERS" (Pittsburgh)
"ECKSTEIN" (Cincinnati)
"JEWETT" (New York)
"KENTUCKY" (Louisville)
"FAHNESTOCK" (Pittsburgh)
"LEWIS" (Philadelphia)
"MORLEY" (Cleveland)
"RED SEAL" (St. Louis)
"SALEM" (Salem, Mass.)
"SHIPMAN" (Chicago)
"SOUTHERN" (St. Louis and Chicago)
"ULSTER" (New York)
"UNION" (New York)

If you are going to paint, it will pay you to send to us for a book containing information that may save you many a dollar; it will only cost you a postal card to do so.

NATIONAL LEAD CO.,

1 Broadway, New York.

Boston Branch: Salem Lead Works,
Boston, Mass.

RELIGIOUS BOOKS.

Lyman Abbott, D. D.

The Evolution of Christianity. A book of remarkable interest and value, containing in a revised form the lectures given by Dr. Abbott to crowded audiences in Boston last winter. \$1.25

Prof. A. V. G. Allen.

The Continuity of Christian Thought. A Study of Modern Theology in the Light of History. *Seventh Edition.* 12mo, gilt top, \$2.00.

Washington Gladden, D. D.

Who Wrote the Bible? \$1.25.

Applied Christianity. Moral Aspects of Social Questions. *Fourth Edition.* \$1.25.

The Lord's Prayer. \$1.00.

William Elliot Griffiths, D. D.

The Lily among Thorns. A Study of the Biblical Drama entitled *The Song of Songs.* \$1.25; white cloth, with gilt top, \$1.50.

Rev. F. W. Gunsaulus.

The Transfiguration of Christ. 16mo, gilt top, \$1.25.

S. E. Herrick, D. D.

Some Heretics of Yesterday. Tauler, Wiclif, Hus, Savonarola, Latimer, Cranmer, Melancthon, Knox, Galvin, Coligny, Brewster, Wesley. \$1.50.

Lucy Larcom.

The Unseen Friend. \$1.00.

As It is in Heaven. \$1.00.

Beckonings for Every Day. A Calendar of Thought. Good, very good, for every year. *Seventh Edition.* \$1.00.

Breathings of the Better Life. Original and Selected. *Seventh Edition.* \$1.25.

Easter Gleams. Poems. Parchment Paper, 75 cents.

J. M. Manning, D. D.

Sermons. With a Steel Portrait. 12mo, \$2.00.

Elisha Mulford, LL. D.

The Republic of God. *Twelfth Edition.* \$2.00.

T. T. Munger, D. D.

The Freedom of Faith. Sermons, with a prefatory essay on "The New Theology." *Nineteenth Edition.* \$1.50.

On the Threshold. For Young People. *Twenty-fifth Edition.* \$1.00.

Lamps and Paths. Sermons for Children. *Eighth Edition.* \$1.00.

The Appeal to Life. Sermons. *Seventh Edition.* \$1.50.

William Burnet Wright, D. D.

Ancient Cities. From the Dawn to the Daylight. *Fifth Edition.* \$1.25.

The World to Come. Sermons, with a remarkably interesting and informing *Lecture on Christmas.* \$1.25.

* For sale by all booksellers. Sent by mail, post-paid, on receipt of price by the publishers.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN & CO., Boston.

[illegible]

THE
ANDOVER REVIEW:
A RELIGIOUS AND THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY.

VOL. XVII.—JUNE, 1892.—No. CII.

MORALITY: WHAT IS BETTER?

THE answer to our question will depend upon the definition given to the word "morality." If that is large enough to take in the universe, there will be no room for discussion, but if with us morality has its common meaning, we shall have no difficulty in understanding one another. One definition, in the new "Century Dictionary," is, "The practice of moral duties regarded as *apart from, and not based upon, vital religious principle.*" Clearly, that is the signification which it is intended to have in this discussion. The phrasing of the question indicates that this is the real inquiry: Is Morality sufficient, or do we need Religion? There will be no difference between us concerning the abstract meaning of the term. Professor Fowler, of Oxford, in his "Progressive Morality," says: "The moral sanction, properly so called, is distinguished from all other sanctions of conduct in that it has no regard to the prospect of physical pleasure or pain, or to the hope of reward or fear of punishment, or to the estimation in which we shall be held by any other being than ourselves, but that it has regard simply and solely to the internal feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with which, on reflection, we shall look back on our own acts" (p. 22).

By morality I understand righteousness. The terms are interchangeable, one being the word of philosophy, and the other of the religion of the Old Testament. If the Jews had done nothing except give to the world that word "righteousness," they would deserve to be held in everlasting remembrance. Is there anything better than righteousness? Clearly there is no room for discussion. That is the ideal toward which all things are tending. To

realize that all churches are working. Considered as an end there is nothing better; but righteousness as a motive has been a failure. Is the practice of moral duties, or righteousness, regarded as apart from and not based upon vital religious principle, the best that can be offered to those who, in the storm and stress of life, are seeking something to satisfy and inspire? Burns, in his dedication to Gavin Hamilton, says:—

“Morality, thou deadly bane,
Thy tens of thousands thou hast slain!
Vain is his hope whose stay and hope is
In moral mercy, truth, and justice!”

There have been two phases of thought concerning this subject. One, satirized by Burns in this stanza, has denounced “mere morality,” and has put all emphasis upon belief; the other, following the example of Burns, has derided theology and religion, and said that all that is needed is morality. As usual, the truth lies between the extremes. There is an evident desire in some quarters to find a basis of moral action other than religion supplies. Philosophy and science have attempted to fashion systems of ethics by ignoring God and the spirit in man. An architect might as well attempt to build a cathedral in the air. Leaving both philosophy and theology, it will be my purpose to present, as distinctly and fairly as I may, certain reasons for believing that morality, in the sense in which it has been defined, is not the best that can be offered to those who in these days are crying, as bitterly as ever, Who will show us any good?

1. Standards of right and wrong have always been associated with the idea of a personal God, and have been clear or dim according to the vividness and purity of that idea. James Martineau says: “This sentiment of duty is not the pure essence of the moral idea itself, but the consciousness of its administration to us from the Supreme Source. It thus appeals to us, not merely as a subjective suggestion, but with the solemn persuasion belonging to any revelation of right from a higher personality” (“Types of Ethical Theory,” p. xxviii).

As the conception of that “higher personality” has risen, the standard of moral obligation has risen; and as the idea has fallen, the standard of morality has fallen. If you find a people with no faith in Deity, you also find an absence of regulative ideas of right and wrong. Those who have banished God from their universe, even though they may have attained high intellectual and physical culture, seldom hold with a strong grasp those ethical

principles which the race has recognized as of universal obligation. Eccentricities of genius are offered as excuses for sensual excesses; truth becomes a matter of expediency; chastity is adjusted to physical well-being; and the obligations of brotherhood almost cease to be recognized. Just here I recall the noble words of Dr. A. P. Peabody, in "King's Chapel Sermons," p. 41 *et passim*: "Loose views as to the worth of religious truth and of fixed religious beliefs are already having their inevitable result in a correspondingly loose, vacillating, and low moral standard. Morality never has subsisted, and never will subsist, without religion." President Eliot, in an address before the Nineteenth Century Club, February 3, 1886 (as reported in the "New York Tribune" of February 4, 1886), said: "Nobody knows how to teach morality effectively without religion. There is no such thing as a science of ethics."

On the other hand, with clear and rational faith in God has ever been associated high and fine morality. Communities do not illustrate this truth as well as individuals, because the good and the bad, believers and unbelievers, are always found together. A man with no God, whether he is a savage or a nineteenth century philosopher, recognizes no obligations except those which will best promote his pleasure or probable well-being; but he who believes in God, and believes in Him as holy, inevitably realizes that he should be holy as God is holy. This is almost a truism, and hardly requires argument. It is commonplace to say that all men are moulded by their ideals. If there is no ideal higher than self, then self becomes the end. If, on the other hand, the ideal is the infinite and perfect, then the one holding it is gradually transformed into that likeness. If, now, we turn to our question, Is there anything better than doing right without thought of God? the reply must be, A man's thought of God is always highest and regulative; if he has no Deity he has no lofty morality, or, if he has, it will be for selfish reasons, and may be changed at any moment for something unworthy, since there is no one higher than self who can command obedience. The answer must be, therefore, that religion, which supposes a relation between God and man, is better than the attempt to do right without the recognition of God. Dörner, in "System of Christian Ethics," says: "But morality . . . can be neither perfect nor pure unless it includes in the love of goodness also the love of the primal Source of goodness, the personal God,—in other words, is or becomes piety. This is requisite, not merely for moral

culture and intelligence, but also especially for the reason that, if that secondary form of the good which exists in the consciousness and will of man should be assumed to be the highest and best, the necessary consequence would be self-deification, that is, a want of the virtue of humility. But this want disfigures even the goodness which may already exist, being a sort of selfishness, even though a comparatively intellectual form of it, as is shown by the pride of virtue among the Stoics. Finally, it would be an error to suppose that morality has as firm a basis without reference to God as with it." If it be said that the result of each moral act is increased light, and that the world's belief concerning the Almighty is the result of virtuous conduct, the reply is, The result of doing right is always larger and clearer illumination; but our question is, Which is the controlling idea? The answer is, Since there can be no faith in God without his being recognized as superior and worthy of homage, the belief concerning Him must regulate all other beliefs and influence all actions. Therefore, since standards of faith rise with ideals of God, moral conduct can attain its finest fruit only when it is rooted in the recognition of God.

2. Morality in itself fails to furnish sufficient motive for doing right. I know what the reply will be: "Do right because it is right; that is motive enough." I freely grant that it is better to do right than wrong, even if there is no God, and death ends all. Justice is better than injustice, purity than impurity, honesty than lying, and if nothing besides personal happiness is considered, even then righteousness pays; but it is one thing to recognize this, and quite another to maintain that knowledge of this fact is sufficient to secure its realization. Now and then a few are found who can honestly say that they have no other motive, that they recognize right and wrong, and that following their intuitions they do the right, and eschew the wrong. But how many have reached that altitude? Theoretically the answer is perfect, but practically it is insufficient; it may be good for the elect, but it is useless for the average man. Furthermore, I believe that that motive always fails. Wise souls respond only to strong motives. "We should do right because it is right;" yes, but who is to determine the right? Suppose that the result of doing right is struggle and suffering! If there is a worthy motive we will not flinch, but will face even death, but what motive is sufficient for these things? Banish God and a future life from your universe; then bring to yourselves this question, "Is it enough for me to

ask what is right? Ought I never to seek what is pleasing? What is right anyway? Does it not, like the chameleon, change with its environment? There is no one above who can call to judgment; life is short at the best; to-day or to-morrow I shall go into absolute nothingness. What difference does it really make what I do?" I may be still in a very low state of evolution, but it seems to me that when God and the immortal life have gone out of the universe, all the inspiration has gone from the idea of right, and little but an imagination remains.

Let me take two or three illustrations. There is in Washington a man utterly helpless; he cannot even brush a fly from his face; he is carrying in his body bullets which have been there since the Rebellion. Often in unutterable agony, he simply exists — a bright and beautiful spirit; one who seems to have been made perfect through suffering. Why should that man live, if after a little while he will simply die? Why not commit suicide? If all that keeps him alive is the satisfaction he has in thinking that he is still alive, when he knows that the end of all is oblivion, why keep up the dismal farce any longer? There is no object even in his being made more perfect, if it is only to die. Michael Angelo said: "I will lift the Pantheon into the air." Would he have kept his promise, and "rounded Peter's Dome" simply for the sake of seeing it fall a shapeless mass when once it had been lifted? Some one says, think of the good that sick man is doing to those who are about him! But why should he do that? Why should he spend a life in misery for the sake of making others better when they, too, are hastening to the same destruction? Would Angelo have spent years in chiseling his Moses, if he had supposed that the moment it was completed, a cruel, but resistless hand would dash it into a thousand fragments? A woman was seen rushing along one of the piers of the North River the other night. Hastily throwing aside a shawl, she leaped into the midst of the ice and the water. The chill brought her to her senses, and she cried: "Save me! Save me!" A man on a boat near by heard the shriek, and responded: "If I can, I will," and jumped into the river. After a terrible struggle, having almost lost his own life, he was drawn to the boat; but the woman was gone. Why should he have tried to save her? She had a sick husband and hungry children at home, and could do nothing for them, and had no outlook for the future. The waters were more hospitable than the world. There was less heartlessness in those icy depths than in great and rich New York. If it

was only a question of a few days, and no sympathy anywhere, why should that woman have lived? Why should that man have tried to save her? Morality sets before a man no object for which to live. "Seek for those things which are highest and best," we are told; but why? If we get them, they will evaporate into air. "Keep on struggling; by and by the race will be better." But the race itself is moving to the same abyss, and death and oblivion is the end of all. "Work to uplift the poor and outcast." Why? If there is no God and no future, then "ignorance is bliss, and 't is folly to be wise." Why should a man who is happy as a beast have created in him aspirations and desires, visions of great things which might be, simply to realize that he is being mocked by his own dreams? Which is better, to leave the peasant happy in his ignorance at the foot of the Matterhorn, or to take him to the crest of that scarred and weather-beaten spire, in order that he may look upon the glory of the creation, and then be hurled a lifeless lump upon the rocks below? Morality furnishes no motive for morality.

3. Morality is not the best because it consists in doing rather than in being, in conduct rather than character; it leaves out of count the inner life. It is conformity to something external. With the Greeks, manners and morals were synonymous, and manners are garments we put on. We call those men moral who do no wrong; within, they may be full of all manner of uncleanness. They are honorable, they tell the truth, they conform to the customs around them. If customs change, they change with them. If the standard of morality were dishonesty, impurity, injustice, they would quickly become adjusted to their environment. Morality presumes no eternal and necessary law of right, but rather conformity to common standards; it is one thing in one time and place, and another in another. The Spartans were moral, who believed it right to steal, but wrong to be found out. Even if morality recognized a law of right, it would work no change in character, for laws can be kept by those whose hearts rebel against them.¹ The highest and finest character is not simply outward conformity to even a perfect standard, but inward harmony with eternal and essential right. "As a man thinketh in his heart, so is he." The world has many who will do right because others do,

¹ Henry James, in *Moralism and Christianity*, 1852, says: "Morals are obedience to human and social law; religion is the product of divine love and light poured into the soul. The former is outward, formal, temporary; the latter inward, spontaneous, permanent."

but not enough who will stand for truth and justice, purity and love, even if they stand alone; men with whom loyalty to their ideal is of more importance than popularity and power; men who will go to the stake and rejoice that the fires which burn them will illuminate others; men who will go to the cross that, being lifted up, they may draw all toward their altitude; men, in short, who are more anxious about truth in the inward parts than conformity to the changing customs of a fickle society.

4. Morality has no medicine for remorse. Remorse is not found in Christian lands alone. How can one who has been wrong get right? has been asked everywhere with pathetic intensity. On the mountains of Thibet, as on Salisbury Plain, are ruins of temples with altars on which sacrifices have been offered to appease an offended Deity; in Christian lands and in heathenism "the cry of the human" has been, "Who shall deliver from this body of death?" A man might as well try to escape from his shadow as from the consciousness of being wrong when he has done wrong. That unknown artist who painted that wonderful picture called "The Father's Curse" — that woman's face, pale and haggard, those far-away-looking eyes, that wild, fierce, desperate expression, that countenance in which despair and defiance are vividly blended — was but copying what can be found any day in the streets of any city. Morality says, Do right: but it has no voice for those who have done wrong, and who pitifully ask for some way in which they can be made right. A man once said to me: "I have lived a life so wicked that it would be wicked for God to forgive me." He was not ignorant, but a college-bred man, a lawyer with wide knowledge of the world, who was not led away by superstition. Who shall answer this world-old question? It has been the problem of all ages. The Greek dramatists were occupied with it. You find it in *Æschylus* and *Sophocles*. Lady Macbeth, trying to wash out the blood spot from her little hand, is true to nature. Go through the world, and to the multitude who feel that they have done wrong, that they are wrong, preach simply, Do right! What will be the effect? Intensely and even fiercely they will reply, We have tried that, and pitifully failed. We long to know whether there is any way by which we can escape from our past, and begin again. Morality apart from religion has no answer to that question. It simply says, Do right, and go on. It points to no one great enough to help, to no power able to forgive, to no love willing to sacrifice. "Go on with all the forces and tendencies toward evil which have been coming

down from a thousand generations blazing in your veins, and with a cruel world about you! Go on. Try to do right, and ask for no help, care for no voice which does not come from the depths of your own heart." All that may sound very fine to a philosopher in his study, or a scholar in his library; but to weary, footsore, heart-broken men and women who have sinned against love and virtue, who have no more outlook in life, those words will fall like ice on flowers already wilted and soiled, and the ice will be no less chilling for being shining. There must be something better than this, or the universe is full of the blackness of darkness for multitudes crying for light.

5. There is in morality itself, as the term is used in this discussion, nothing which tends to inspire high and heroic endeavor for the alleviation of the ills of humanity, because there is nothing in it which gives great ideas of man and his destiny. We call that man moral who does what comes to his hand, who is honest, generous, pure, a good husband, a good father, a good citizen; but voluntarily to undertake to lift those who have no claim on us to better conditions, at great and unappreciated cost, at the sacrifice of time, pleasure, the finest feelings, and even health itself, requires some more heroic stuff. Those who have had no outlook toward God and a future life have done comparatively little in the line of missions and reforms. We may smile at Christian missionaries, call them narrow and fanatical, men who could get nothing to do at home; but when I think of David Livingstone sending to England the wife and children whom he loved as his own life, that alone he might penetrate to the depths of Africa; when I think of him going clear across to the Eastern Ocean and back again to the Western Ocean, surrounded only by savages, with no one to comfort and no one to cheer; when I remember that he made all his journeys with but one object,—to carry light into darkness, and help to those who scorned it; to make sure that his piercing appeal, that civilization would do something to heal the open sore of the world, the slave-trade, would awaken a response in many lands; and then when I remember that that man, on the longest of all his journeys, with no white companion with him in the depths of the Dark Continent, was found dead one morning by his servant, kneeling by his bed in the act of prayer, with his head on the Bible he loved so well, I realize that there is a motive great enough to take men out of themselves. It is not in the satisfaction of doing right alone; it is in that vision of humanity which comes with the con-

sciousness that all men are brethren, because all are the children of one Father; that all men are worth saving, because all are heirs of an endless life. It would be a commonplace for me to call attention to the fact that the mission work of the world has been done by those who have been impelled by religious motives. The inspiration which sent Judson and his beautiful dark-eyed wife to that life of unparalleled heroism in Burmah; that sent Hannington to Central Africa; that sent Father Damien to the lepers of the Sandwich Islands; that caused those Moravian missionaries, who seem to me sometimes to have been the rarest heroes that the world ever saw, to the West Indies, and induced them, when they found that they could reach slaves in no other way, to sell themselves into slavery, in order that they might preach the gospel to slaves, came not from a simple thought of right within their own hearts, but from such a vision as Isaiah had when he saw the Lord, and a realization of the greatness of those words which the Master spoke, "All ye are brethren."

Our question is, *Morality: What is better?* Our reply is, Anything which makes clear and vivid the reality of God, human brotherhood, and the spiritual nature of man. Zoroaster, in his doctrine of the unity and spirituality of God, offers something better; the Jewish religion, which shows us Job in the midst of unutterable agony, crying, "The Lord gave, and the Lord hath taken away: blessed be the name of the Lord," is infinitely better; the religion of Jesus Christ is best of all. No matter how it came, or whether it is natural or supernatural: do not even ask for the moment whether the Christian's Master was a man alone or in a unique sense the Son of God; but simply consider his message. It presents the highest ideal of righteousness, — "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart;" "Love one another as I have loved you." It furnishes, also, adequate motives toward a life of righteousness. Why should a man do right, sacrifice and suffer, if need be, looking to little on earth but misunderstanding and abuse? Because he is not an atom in an infinite whirl, but a child of God the Father Almighty, who never forgets his children, and who will some time, somehow, make "good the final goal of ill."

Why sacrifice to uplift the outcast and vicious? Because all races and all colors are children of one Father, and that weak woman on the street, that black and ignorant slave, and that drunken wretch are in the image of the God of eternity. Why should we do right? Because death is not the end of existence,

but only the freeing of the spirit. It has been beautifully said :
" If there is no life beyond, man is like a star without an orbit."

Finally: there is such a thing as "the rest of faith." Human life is environed with mystery. Terribly persistent problems press upon all earnest souls. Professor Wallace, of Oxford, addressing his class on the "Metaphysics of Ethics" one day, said that there was no happiness for the thinking man. Sorrow, remorse, disappointment, physical pain, the infidelity of friends, and death sooner or later, do their work on the best of us. None are impervious to these storms. Riches cannot bring immunity, and strength cannot ward them off. The Buddhist's theory of life is condensed in Edwin Arnold's terrible line: —

"And life is woe;"

and the conclusion of the Stoics was almost equally dreary: "Who, then, is unconquerable? He whom the inevitable cannot overcome." Professor Wallace was right. There is no peace for the thinker, unless in some way he learns the wisdom of Professor F. E. Abbott's dictum, "Either we must cease to think, or we must think more profoundly;" and thinking more profoundly leads at last through the clouds into the clear light of the Eternal Love. I would not be imagined to make light of morality. I have no sympathy with those who say that goodness in itself is of no value. That seems to me absurd. Rather as one who faces the solemn facts of life, and the more solemn reality of death, I am ready to say that I can see no light whatever in the midst of the midnight which does not come from faith in God, and in the eternal life. Simply doing right gives neither peace nor rest; satisfaction results no doubt, but that peace and rest which follow the consciousness that all things are moving upward, because all are in the Father's hands, must evermore be absent. If, now, some one says, We know *right*, and we know nothing of God, I reply, That is a mistake; we know right only by faith, and we know God only by faith; and right and God are joined together, and whoever tries to divorce them takes the soul out of right, and it becomes a mere dream which will break with the waking, — if there is any waking. Faith in the fundamental facts of religion adds new glory to life and the universe. The Christian can hardly help being an optimist. To him nothing is left to chance or fate, but all the processes of history are in the hands of infinite and eternal love. He sees that love manifesting itself in the glory and splendor of the creation. It flashes in the lightning and blooms in the tiniest

flower ; it flames in the blue and gold of a winter sunset, and in the coloring which like a banner is unrolled over autumnal forests. Since men live and move and have their being in God, the weakest child and strongest man alike have their places to fill and their duties to perform in the infinite plan. Even what at first seem to be evils are found to be ministers of love : sorrows, to work together for good ; disease and pain, disappointment and loss, to fashion the finest characters ; while even death becomes a door into unending progress and "far-off infinite bliss." The man of no faith can hardly help being a pessimist ; but he whose universe is pervaded by love can never be altogether sad. Moreover, to him who lives in the presence of God and the anticipation of immortality, service becomes a privilege, and sacrifice a joy. Not only this ; righteousness, — which is the highest ideal of morality, complete accord with all moral and physical laws, perfect harmony with the universe, — from becoming a duty difficult of realization, becomes a sacred passion, which can be satisfied only in voluntary union of the human with the divine. Thus, while the highest ideal of righteousness is not possible without religion, in so far as pure religion becomes reality, the highest and finest righteousness inevitably follows. But that religion must be no sentimental admiration of impersonal beauty or illimitable power, but conscious loyalty to a person great, holy, and attractive enough to transform character. Morality, while it may now and then manifest itself in noble conduct, logically ends in pessimism ; but religion inevitably blooms and bears fruit in righteousness, and cannot be imagined to exist without it ; while at the same time, and as naturally as the sun clothes the gardens in garments of beauty and glory, it fills all obedient and loving spirits with peace which passeth understanding, and joy which flows like the rivers of God.

It is interesting to observe how these different theories work themselves out in life. Renan, in "Recollections and Letters," says, "Our immense moral, and perhaps intellectual, decline will follow the day when religion disappears from the world. *We* can get along without religion because others have it for us. Even those who do not believe are swept along by the more or less believing masses ; but woe to us on that day when the masses no longer have any enthusiasm ! One can do much less with a humanity which does not believe in the immortality of the soul than with a humanity which does believe in it. A man's value depends upon the proportion of the religious sentiment which he

has carried away with him from his early education, and which perfumes his whole life. The religious zones of humanity live on a shadow. *We* live upon the shadow of a shadow. What will the people who come after us live upon?" Let Renan's greater countryman, Victor Hugo, answer that question with his noble verse, which reveals the secret of his inspiring optimism:—

"Ye mourners, come to God, He, too, has tears;
Ye sufferers, come, He only cures your pains;
Ye tremblers, come, He smiles away your fears;
And ye who pass, come also, He remains."

When Mr. Darwin died, he made the author of "*Physicus*" his literary executor. "*Physicus*" was Mr. George J. Romanes, almost as well known in scientific circles as his great master. In his book, after saying that he was obliged to give up his faith in religion, he makes this remarkable confession: "Forasmuch as I am far from being able to agree with those who affirm that the twilight doctrine of the new faith is a desirable substitute for the waning splendor of the old, I am not ashamed to confess that with this virtual negation of God the universe has lost to me its soul of loveliness, and although from henceforth the precept to 'work while it is day' will doubtless but gain an intensified force from the intensified meaning of the words that 'the night cometh when no man can work,' yet when at times I think—as think at times I must—of the appalling contrast between the hallowed glory of that creed which once was mine and the lonely mystery of existence as now I find it, at such times I shall ever feel it impossible to avoid the sharpest pang of which my nature is susceptible." These are the words of an honest man who faces the darkness, and, as best he can, tries to walk on without a torch in the gloom. And I cannot help contrasting them with the words of our own sweet Quaker poet, who, beyond his fourscore years, is still singing in the same strain in which he sang years ago:—

"And so beside the silent sea
I wait the muffled oar,
No harm from Him can come to me,
On ocean or on shore."

Dr. Maudsley closes his "*Body and Will*"—one of the dreariest books ever written—with these words: "The philosopher of to-day who can tell us what happened when the foundations of the earth were laid, and the morning stars sang together, will no doubt be ready to tell us exactly what will happen when the foundations of the earth are unlaied and the morning stars shall cease to sing

together; those who have not his confident insight into creations and uncreations will be content to hold their peace lest they should speak without knowledge words that are without wisdom. But be the words spoken the words of folly or of wisdom, they are in the end alike vanity. 'All that which is past is as a dream; and he that hopes or depends upon Time coming, dreams waking.'"

Beside such cold and dreary atheism, how like a breath of the west wind on a summer's day come the noble words of Carlyle, who, with all his wanderings, never wandered from God: "What is nature? . . . Art not thou the 'Living Garment of God'? O Heavens, is it in very deed He, then, that ever speaks through thee; that lives and loves in thee that lives and loves in me? The universe is not dead and demoniacal, a charnel-house with spectres; but God-like and my Father's! . . . Love not Pleasure; love God. This is the *Everlasting Yea*, wherein all contradiction is solved; wherein whoso walks and works, it is well with him."

Amiel in his journal says: "There is but one thing needful — to know God." If Amiel was right, then those are wrong who say that there is nothing better than morality, and Micah (vi. 8) has stated the whole truth in his question: "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, and to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God?"

Amory H. Bradford.

MONTCLAIR, N. J.

LEADERS OF WIDENING CHRISTIAN LIFE AND THOUGHT.

II. JOHN MCLEOD CAMPBELL.

THE sketch of Thomas Erskine, already presented in this "Review," is scarcely complete without the companion sketch of his almost lifelong friend, John McLeod Campbell, to whom he was bound by ties of closest affection and sympathy in those thoughts and emotions which go down to the very roots of our deepest and truest being. Each undoubtedly reacted on the other, and so strong was the influence of their close communion that it needed no very keen observation to trace, in their later years, a remarkable similarity of expression in countenances originally cast in a

very different mould. In some respects they were complementary to each other, and the history of their spiritual development and life-work is so interwoven that the portrait of the one can scarcely be drawn without at least a shadowy reflection of the other somewhere in the background.

Nevertheless they were strikingly different personalities. While Mr. Erskine possessed not only a profoundly reflective, but also a widely absorbent mind, taking in many different sides of life, John McLeod Campbell was a noble specimen of the Celt, — remarkable for fervid concentration and intensity, rather than breadth, although his profound spiritual insight and loving catholicity of spirit made it impossible for him to be narrow or one-sided. His interests, however, ran in a more restricted circle, as may be seen by comparing the letters of the two ; but that circle included all that is of deepest and most enduring interest to our common humanity. As Mr. Erskine was a true *seer*, so John McLeod Campbell was an anointed priest, by the truest spiritual anointing, and continued to be, through all his long life, a faithful minister to the sin-burdened heart of man. Even the unhappy events which arbitrarily removed him from his beloved parish only widened his field of labor, which afterwards extended to all who had need of him, wherever he might be. To this holy mission his life seemed, as it were, separated and set apart.

John McLeod Campbell's life began almost simultaneously with our century, — in May, 1800. The first few years of his life were spent amid the picturesque and inspiring scenery of a "Highland Parish," not unlike that in which his cousin, Norman McLeod, was then also growing up, and which he has since so graphically described for us. "The Manse" stood on a hill-top, overlooking one of the "lochs," or fiords, so numerous on that deeply indented coast, where he so often watched the "outflow to, and inflow from, the Atlantic, in sun and shade," leaving impressions vividly recalled in later years, — "the golden light of the bright west making the ten miles between us and Mull one sea of 'gold like unto glass,' or, in stormy weather, the waves rolling in from the Atlantic, with all the space between us and America to swell through, breaking on the points of Kerrera."

His mother was the daughter of one of the old chiefs of Skye, McLeod of Raasay, from whom he took his second name ; but she died in his early childhood, leaving her three children to a father who well discharged the double part of father and mother in one, and was loved and revered accordingly. The Rev. Donald Camp-

bell was an admirable specimen of a divine of the school of Clarke and Tillotson, and his sons found in him a wise and faithful teacher, as well as a sympathetic companion, to whom they were bound by an exceptionally strong and enthusiastic affection. The simple-hearted peasants around them, of a type fast dying out, were principally Gaelic, which might be said to be almost the boy's mother-tongue, — the tongue in which his father frequently preached, and in which, from an allusion in one of Mr. Campbell's letters, the morning and evening worship at the Manse was usually conducted.

Scottish boys went early to college in those days, and in his twelfth year young Campbell entered the old University of Glasgow. At fifteen we find him taking his first prize in the Logic class, — his attendance on which, under Jardine, he regarded as an epoch in his mental growth. In the following year he attended the Moral Philosophy class, and received the commendation of the professor for an essay in which he ventured to maintain that conception is a primary faculty, in opposition to the views of the professor himself. But though the winters were given to hard study, which might be thought premature for a lad of his years, the summers were full of boyish activity and healthful recreation, taken chiefly in excursions in rough sailing-boats along that wild, west coast, with whose sombre grandeur Mr. William Black has made us so familiar. The Manse of Morven, the "Highland Parish" of Norman McLeod, was one of the favorite halting-places, where the afternoons were spent in roaming the hills, and the evenings in simple family dancing, probably to the strains of the bagpipes, and — after the early family worship and supper — in singing the stirring old songs of Scotland, which have held such a magic power over Scottish hearts at home and abroad. All who have read Norman McLeod's delightful sketches of his own happy home life will readily recall its simple joyousness, and, though John McLeod Campbell was one of the most deeply spiritual of men, he possessed no trace of that narrowness or asceticism which is so readily associated with Puritan Scotland. Sometimes these expeditions extended to the Isle of Skye, and included a visit to his mother's birthplace, Raasay, which he regarded as "one of the most beautiful places on the face of the earth," — "a beautiful house, with the most sublime assemblage of Skye hills opposite." In these happy summer wanderings, he was doubtless laying up a reserve store of mental and physical health for future days of work and strain, while also

led towards those deeper spiritual meditations which had come to him so early, and which the grand mountain scenery about him was so well fitted to foster. In his nineteenth year, the little home circle at Kilninver was broken by the removal of his only sister, who accompanied her cousin, Lady Hastings, to India, where she was married in the following year to James Macnabb, Esq., then in the Bengal Civil Service, afterwards of Arthurstallie, Perthshire. In his letters to this beloved sister, we can see not only how great was the trial of the separation to his warmly affectionate nature, but also the earnest piety which was, even then, the mainspring of his life. Indeed, his intense early realization of Christian truth, from personal experience, seems to have preserved him from even the temporary phase of doubt which for a time clouded the faith of his friend, Mr. Erskine. From the first, the Christian ministry seems to have been his destined career.

His twenty-first year was spent at the manse of another Highland clerical relative, in order to assist him in the compilation of a Gaelic dictionary, — partly with the view of perfecting himself in a language in which he expected to preach more or less frequently. His early familiarity with Gaelic had, however, a somewhat unfavorable effect on his English style, for with all his clearness of thought and conception he never ceased to feel a certain difficulty in English composition, which gave to his written works, as distinct from his spoken sermons, a somewhat labored character, very different from the easy and lucid grace of Mr. Erskine's flowing diction.

At twenty-one he had completed his full course of study as a theological student, in addition to other studies of more general interest voluntarily undertaken, and received license as a minister of the gospel. He had, even previously to this, received a recommendation from the principal of Glasgow University as a candidate for that London church over which, a year later, Edward Irving was ordained. No step, however, was taken towards securing an appointment which, if accomplished, would so greatly have altered the course of his own life and that of Edward Irving. He had long cherished "a dream of Oxford," but, finding that this could not be realized without taking an oath inconsistent with his position as a Scottish minister, he reluctantly gave up the project. His two following winters were spent principally in attending lectures and occasionally preaching in Edinburgh, where Sir William Hamilton, fresh from Oxford, was lecturing on His-

tory. At twenty-five he received a "presentation" to the parish of Row,¹ — for those were the days of patronage, and a presentation was the necessary preliminary to a parish ministry in the Church of Scotland. That church was then divided into two sharply marked parties, called respectively "Moderate" and "Evangelical," — the latter answering, in some respects, to the "Evangelical" branch of the Church of England. As is always the case, party feeling had caused much practical evil, which Mr. Campbell so fully realized that he determined to maintain a strictly neutral position, — a neutrality which had important results at a critical period of his own history. He entered his new charge with a deep feeling of his responsibility, and an earnest desire to discharge it aright, but as yet without any definite perception of the cause of the great general lack of living religion, which he speedily recognized with surprise and profound sorrow.

His subsequent divergence alike from the narrow traditional theology then and there so prevalent, and from the crude popular idea of "religion," was, as all advances on the path of truth must be, the result, not of mere speculation, but of setting to work in earnest to solve the practical problems before him. His own conviction that religion was to be the spiritual root of the whole moral being, not a thing of times and seasons, he found contradicted by the popular idea that, if people should "give a little of their time to God, they might, with an easier conscience, enjoy themselves in the use of it," — an idea always accompanying a mere ceremonial religiousness, under whatever name. In short, when he came face to face with the realities of human life, he found such a discrepancy between the prevailing religion and that of the New Testament, that he was forced to inquire into the cause and the remedy. To this task he addressed himself with all the ardor of a young apostle.

The parish of Row was set in the midst of one of the most beautiful and romantic regions of western Scotland, — a land of noble hills and picturesque mountain fiords. It lay on the shore of one of these fiords, the Gareloch, proverbial in Scotland for its striking beauty. In his ministrations amid the rural homes of his parishioners, he had the constant influence of natural sublimity, — intensely strong on a mind like his, — blended with his deep practical interest in the eternal problem of the relation of the human to the divine, which was ever present with him. We have one interesting glimpse of the earnest young minister stand-

¹ Pronounced *Rue*.

ing with an aged couple on a hill overlooking the beautiful loch, and receiving the husband's characteristic exhortation: "Give us plain doctrine, Mr. Campbell, for we are a sleeping people;" while the "gude wife" solemnly quoted the sacred words: "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life." This incident, so illustrative of the high tone of thought and spirituality formerly often found among the Scottish peasantry, made a deep impression on Mr. Campbell, and both injunctions were faithfully fulfilled. In his nearest ministerial neighbor, the Rev. Robert Story, minister of the parish of Roseneath, — a man of a loving heart, evangelical warmth and simplicity, and much beauty of character, — Mr. Campbell soon found a warm and congenial friend, with whom he could take "sweet counsel," and who could and did give him much brotherly sympathy and fellowship, — especially in the great crisis of his life, his collision with external ecclesiastical authority. The old parish manse not being in a habitable condition, Mr. Campbell took up his residence — while a new one was being built — in his picturesque temporary home of Shandon Cottage, *Gaelicé*, Badminver, meaning a tuft of trees at the estuary of a stream.

In this quiet retreat six years of earnest work passed rapidly away. His pastoral work was more and more showing him the needs of his people, and, through them, of all people, and his studies were more and more tending towards the great central points round which all his subsequent teaching naturally grew. A few months after his settlement we find him reading, with great delight, the first publication of his as yet unknown friend, Mr. Erskine, on the "Internal Evidence of Christianity," of which he says: "It is the only work with that title which deserves the name, as it really is an extracting of evidence from the peculiarities of the scheme itself, and in it is put upon its proper ground the connection between the doctrines and the morality of the gospel. He feels that it is most dangerous to receive them as two distinct things, and his language, which you will remember was mine, is: 'I don't say, believe the one, and, because you believe the one, do the other. Yea, examine your belief, and you will find it the deepest basis on which morality rested.'" This thought ran through all his teaching, together with the further one, thus expressed in a letter to his father: "'He that hath seen the Son hath seen the Father.'" This is, to me, a very favorite passage, the truth it contains being the anchor of my soul, namely, that, knowing the mind and feelings of Christ, I know the mind

and feelings of God. Any soul knowing the amount of the statement, and believing its truth, must be found trusting in God, with a trust inspired simply by the knowledge of what He is, and trusting in his character." The outline of the sermon mentioned in this same letter, as preached on the same day on which it was written, foreshadows the teaching of his future great work on "The Nature of the Atonement." But he soon found out, in his efforts to lead his people into a more consistent and spiritual religious life, that the *root* was lacking, — that "heart religion was at a low ebb," though men often found a false "peace in combination of an orthodox creed with much religious bustle."

In the mean time, he was hard at work in his mountain parish. At one time we find him "preaching in a glen which has about a hundred inhabitants, among whom I know of only one who has received the gospel." To his father he always gave, in his weekly letter, an outline of the sermon he had preached on the preceding Sunday. In a letter to the absent sister in India, his father gives the following frank tribute to the devotion of his son: "Your brother is certainly the most uncommon young man I ever was acquainted with. His talents are very good, but little to his zeal and industry in his great work, — the salvation of souls. He is thought rather strict by some people, and he and I do not entirely agree in some points; but would to God that all of us in the same sacred office had our hearts so deeply and thoroughly impressed as he is with the truth and power of sacred things."

In his ministerial teaching, he met his people, as he tells us in his own very full "Reminiscences and Reflections," on the common ground laid down in the first question and answer in the Shorter Catechism, — that the will of God for man, and the very end of his being, is "to glorify God, and enjoy Him forever." It was in the earnest endeavor to fix their attention on the love of God revealed in Christ, instead of on some goodness of their own that would warrant them in drawing nigh to Him, that his teaching on the subject of the "Assurance of Faith" began to be misconceived by crude and unspiritual minds, and was eventually denounced as heretical. For, in his anxious consideration of the spiritual condition of his people, and of the small effect of his earlier labors in bringing out those fruits of faith which he so earnestly desired to see, he became convinced that, in order to make them free to serve God with a pure, disinterested love to Him, "their first step in religion would require to be, resting assured of his love to them in Christ as individuals, and

of their individually having eternal life given to them in Christ." This conviction led to the further conclusion that, "unless God had died for *all*, — unless He was, indeed, the gift of God to every human being, — there was no sufficient warrant for calling on men to be assured of God's love to them." And as, in the course of his direct dealing with his people, he came to feel practically the need of man awakening to consciousness of alienation from God and seeking the peace of true reconciliation or *Atonement*, he was led more and more to regard the doctrine of the Atonement as "that master truth of which the soul that has once seen it shall never have enough through eternal ages." But the very fullness with which Mr. Campbell preached the gospel of God's forgiving love to all soon came into collision with the cherished preconceptions of some as to the distinction between the elect and non-elect, while those who had already begun to object to his teaching of assurance as dangerous held that it became much more so, as connected with a doctrine of universal pardon which they equally misconceived.

The interests of this period of his life connect him, in an interesting way, with the two great Scottish preachers of his time, Chalmers and Irving. Dr. Chalmers was then a popular preacher in Glasgow, and Edward Irving, at the height of his London popularity, had come to Edinburgh to deliver a course of lectures on the Apocalypse, to a house crowded at the unusual hour of six A. M. Mr. Campbell went to Edinburgh to lay before these two brethren the conclusions to which he had come, and the practical experiences in which he had wrought them out, hoping that the grounds on which his convictions were based might commend themselves to them also. It is an instance of the inaccuracies which will sometimes creep into the best biographies that, in Mrs. Oliphant's very sympathetic "Life of Irving," this incident — mentioned to her by Mr. Campbell himself — is represented as a visit from Campbell to Irving, "to consult him in regard to his *difficulties*," — difficulties which had no existence. A few weeks later, Irving visited Mr. Campbell at Row, and preached in his church, and was, as he said in a letter to a friend, "much delighted" both with Campbell and his close friend, Alexander Scott. At parting, after a time of happy brotherly communion, Irving said, after a parting prayer: "Dear Campbell, may your bosom be a pillow for me to rest upon, and my arm a staff for you to lean upon!" "From that time," says Mr. Campbell, "he preached the Atonement as for all, and the faith of the love mani-

fested in it as the great power to awaken the deep sense of sin, as well as to quicken love to Him who first loved us." This was, of course, long before any of the occurrences which led Irving to his afterwards erratic course, and with which Mr. Campbell had nothing to do.

It was about the same time, early in 1828, that Mr. Erskine and he — predestined brothers in soul — first came into personal contact. Mr. Erskine's little book on "The Freeness of the Gospel" had been published in 1827, quite independently of Mr. Campbell, — of whom he *then* knew nothing, — though teaching the same truth of the belief of God's free and forgiving love in Christ as the root of a real salvation. During the following winter or spring, Mr. Erskine first heard Mr. Campbell preach in Edinburgh with great delight; and shortly after, the common friend of both, Alexander Scott, was the means of bringing them together, — taking Mr. Campbell to Mr. Erskine as to one who "knew the love of God in which we were seeing eye to eye." Their friendship, begun on such a common ground, ripened fast, and Mr. Erskine spent part of the following summer at Row, for the sake of being near the devoted young clergyman, whose preachings were so entirely after his own heart; the communion of thought and spirit between two so like-minded refreshing and strengthening them both, in the face of the increasing murmurs of disapprobation which began to arise from the jealous defenders of a hard, traditional theology.

Allusion has already been made to the two parties into which the Church of Scotland was at this time divided, and to the fact of Mr. Campbell's strictly neutral position; though he naturally had more affinity with the "Evangelical" than with the "Moderate" division. The following sketch of the condition of the religious teaching of Scotland at this period will throw light both on the special peculiarities of Mr. Campbell's preaching, and on the opposition it speedily awoke. It is quoted from the "Life of Mr. Story," by his son: —

"The theology of Scotland, as might have been expected of theology reared on so purely dogmatic a foundation, had gradually ceased to have much living influence on the popular conscience, though it had graven its outlines deeply on the popular understanding. The doctrines of the Confession, as commonly set forth in all the accuracy of their irrefragable logic, were not thought to have any very close connection with existing thought and action. As a natural result, the preaching of national pulpits,

diverging into two branches, became either a mere ethical or practical discoursing, without any doctrinal or spiritual basis, or a formal exposition of Calvinistic doctrines tending rather to foster a morbid self-consciousness than a free and loving development of Christian life. The 'Moderate' was a preacher of morals, who too seldom made any reference to their root and sanction in Christ; the 'Evangelical' preacher was a preacher of Genevan doctrines, who was too generally rather engrossed with the harmonies of his system than conscious of the wants and questionings of humanity, which it was insufficient to meet and unable to answer. A religion of this type begot too marked an isolation of the individual, and obscured the great central fact of God's fatherly relation to *all*, by teaching each man to regard his relation to God as affected or determined by his own personal condition or belief. But neither of these modes of setting forth the truth was exhaustive or satisfactory. Neither fully occupied the minds or met the spiritual wants of earnest men within the church. Much of the most zealous Christian life gradually withdrew itself from the pale of the Establishment; not a few of those who were most thoughtful and pious seceded from its communion, in the hope of finding elsewhere a more living spirit of Christianity."

To meet the need thus described, Mr. Campbell's fresh and spiritual preaching was precisely adapted, and soon began to attract the notice of earnest seekers, as well as of dogmatic cavilers. The publication, about the same time, of Mr. Story's "*Life of Isabella Campbell*," which had at the time a widespread popularity in Scotland and even in America, helped to deepen this growing interest. It was the unadorned narrative of the life and death of a simple Highland girl, a parishioner of Mr. Story's, — a life that, through a lingering illness ending in a saintly death, drew its joy and peace from a simple and living dependence on God the Father and Christ the Reconciler. Mr. Campbell had frequently visited her during the prolonged absence of his friend, Mr. Story, and his letters contain repeated references to the satisfaction he received from them. The memoir was blessed to many; among others, William Wilberforce records the pleasure and edification with which he read it; and the associations connected with it tended to increase the interest felt in the vicinity of "the Row" by many who thirsted for a fuller measure of spiritual life, and who found the new development and expansion of gospel teaching for which they were craving in

the preaching of McLeod Campbell. Not a few earnest thinkers and seekers for truth — including thoughtful divinity students — gladly availed themselves of the opportunities presented by the Gareloch as a summer resort, to share the privilege of Mr. Campbell's deeply spiritual preaching. Among those who thus came under his influence was the mother of the present writer, whose lifelong friendship with both Mr. Erskine and Mr. Campbell, begun about this time, was a source of much spiritual benefit to her through the whole of her after-life as a clergyman's wife in Canada, and, through her, of benefit to many others. And from the letters from both in the writer's possession, it would seem that, as almost always happens, the benefit was reciprocal. Her deep interest in the succeeding events which transpired before she left Scotland to enter on a new life in the New World descended to the writer by a natural inheritance.

But, while many who were seeking light were receiving abundant blessing from such fresh and vital teaching, the "old story" was beginning to repeat itself, and those who were *not* seekers, but self-complacent "professors," of religion, according to their own narrow views of "orthodoxy," began to take the alarm, while murmurs of dissatisfaction began to be heard among Mr. Campbell's ministerial brethren. On Thursday, December 20, 1827, he had preached a charity sermon in Glasgow, on the text, "Sanctify them by the truth," from which afterwards dated the opposition of his brethren, many of whom were his hearers. He wrote soon after to Mr. Story: "The Glasgow ministers have all taken alarm." This "alarm" was more especially connected with his teaching on the subject of "Assurance," by which *he* meant only assured belief in the forgiving love of God to men *as* men, and the freeness of the gift of eternal life, — that assurance of God's forgiving love on which man may fearlessly rest all his hopes of salvation; while to most Scottish minds "Assurance" meant chiefly the assurance of personal salvation, by which then too often was meant simply the remission of future penalties, and the secure prospect of eternal bliss. This naturally led to a misconception of Mr. Campbell's teaching, which also suffered from the inability of men accustomed to a certain traditional system to enter into his point of view, — especially as it also ultimately came into collision with the cherished belief, at that time almost universal among Scottish Presbyterians, of a Limited Atonement; for, as Mr. Campbell had soon found, the universality of the love of God and of Christ's atoning work was implied

in it. But, singularly enough as it seems at first sight, this, which seems to most of us to-day one of the most elementary truths of religion, was unpalatable even to many who had been pleased with his teaching on Assurance, showing how little they had understood that teaching by making the objection that, if the Atonement were universal, *individual Christians were deprived of all assurance*, thus plainly preferring to rest their hope of salvation rather on the supposed partiality of a ruler towards *some* of his subjects, than on the depth and width of the love of the Divine Father! From this time his teaching became identified with what was called the "doctrine of Universal Pardon," by which Mr. Campbell simply meant that in Christ the gift of eternal life had "come upon all men unto justification of life." By his opponents, however, this gospel of a universal forgiveness was taken to mean the same thing as *universal salvation*, and all that Mr. Campbell and his friends could do to remove this erroneous impression seemed to fall on unheeding ears. The disappointment he felt at the revelation of spiritual blindness in many of whom he had hoped well, he thus describes in his "Reminiscences: " "I was made to mourn over the opposition to the doctrine of eternal pardon, taking such forms as, 'If all are forgiven, then we need not repent nor be sorry for our sins, or think of a future judgment, and we may do as we please;' for it was thus apparent, beyond all my previous fears, that what men called 'repentance' was not a real sorrow for sin, but merely something offered in exchange for safety." At a later period, he came to regret that he had not been more carefully guarded in his language, so as to express the truth in words less likely to be misunderstood. Yet it was, in many cases, a *willful* misunderstanding,—the fruit of a hardness of heart which he could scarcely have imagined beforehand. He found himself, he says, "charged with Antinomianism, and with setting forth doctrines leading to licentiousness, and, as if to stamp the character of the opposition awakened, it first took active form in the persons of some individuals of much practical ungodliness."

Much of the good seed, however, fell on good ground. Not a few of his hearers could say, "It is quite a new gospel to me;" or, "I never understood the Scriptures before;" or, "The same Scripture in this light has a melting and novel influence, which, without it, never was felt or thought of." "Yet," wrote one of his friends, "as the opposition comes chiefly from the Evangelical clergy, whose influence is so extensive, it is formidable." As to

this, Mr. Campbell himself wrote: "Oh, you do not know how the idea of peace toward God, from the simple belief of his words, without waiting for evidence, is resisted by those who have long been leading their flocks through the dark and desolate places of their own hearts, instead of leading them to Jesus, and causing them to look unto Him and be saved."

The following quotations — taken almost at random from the volumes, now out of print, which contain many of Mr. Campbell's sermons at Row, from short-hand notes — will show how remote was his deep and searching teaching from bearing out the misrepresentations he has mentioned, and their tone is distinctive of his lifelong teaching: "The gift of God is eternal life, — that life which was with the Father before the world was; this is what God has given to us. Now it is quite obvious that this must exclude many of the things we have been looking for. We have been looking for safety, for security, for exemption from penalties, for a happiness of some kind or other. But any one who will consider that the thing which God says He gives us is eternal life must at once see that all his ideas of this kind must be erroneous. It is not *safety* that could be dignified with the name of the 'eternal life' which was with the Father; it is not a *mere happiness* which God is said to have had from all eternity! The eternal life which was with the Father is that thing in God which made God infinitely blessed." "I know quite well that, when a person says to men that their sins are forgiven, he is supposed to be saying that they are not to be punished, — that there is no wrath awaiting them. But what *is* said is this, that God has done that in Christ which He saw to be right for the purpose of placing you on the footing of innocent persons; so that you are as perfectly free to come to God at this moment as if you had never sinned at all. Now this is all that I conceive to be involved in your sin being put away; this is *all*, and surely it is *everything*." "Christ's own righteousness was a righteousness of faith. He lived by faith, — a perfect faith in his Father; and his own righteousness was a righteousness that was by faith. Now our righteousness is to be by faith in Christ, and it is a *real thing*, and a *holy state*, the state of believing in the holy love of God; it is just one with the love that is believed, and it is no fiction. But it is the constant craving of the natural heart to get away from the necessity of dwelling in holiness in order to dwell in happiness, — to get away from the necessity of walking close with God, and of dwelling in God's love, in order to have peace and confidence toward God."

Even in our own day, when such thoughts as these have been popularized in the writings of F. W. Robertson, George Macdonald, and many others, — in such poems as those of Whittier and Browning, and in the most spiritual hymns, — such truths are too little comprehended; but, compared with the hard, cold, traditional theology then too generally prevalent, it was as light to darkness, and it is little wonder if the darkness comprehended it not. The conflict soon became an open one. From the discussion of theological essays in ministerial gatherings, the opposition now became so pronounced that pulpits were closed to him; and brethren refused to coöperate with him in evangelical work, while, in some cases, the disapprobation included his friend, Mr. Story, whose preaching was animated by the same spirit, although, being expressed in more exclusively Scriptural language, it was less vulnerable. At last, the first steps were taken in the direction of ecclesiastical procedure. Encouraged, no doubt, by the clerical opposition, a few of the least worthy of his parishioners signed a memorial entreating the Presbytery to investigate what had by this time come to be called the "Row Heresy," and to "deliver the parish from the oppression of such pernicious errors as were taught by the minister." When this petition was presented to the Presbytery of Dunbarton, no inquiry seems to have been made into the Christian character of the memorialists, or their fitness to judge in such a matter, — one of them being a drunken tailor and another a notorious smuggler. A counter petition was, at the same time, sent in, without any communication with Mr. Campbell, signed by eighty heads of families of unexceptionable standing, including Lord John Campbell, brother of the Duke of Argyle, begging the Presbytery "to do nothing to weaken the hands of a minister who so faithfully preached the necessity of believing the gospel, of resting on the Lord Jesus Christ alone for salvation, of departing from all iniquity, and living in the hope of a glorious immortality." But while the first memorial was received, the second was rejected at the Presbytery meeting in March, the spirit of which, towards this saintly young apostle, may be gathered from the facts that one member, in a furious speech, moved that they should "at once proceed to root out this pestilential heresy," and that Mr. Campbell was refused, on a technical pretext, the courtesy of a hearing, one voice declaring that "he deserved no courtesy from the Presbytery!" Such unreasonable animosity against so blameless and devoted a brother would seem almost incredible, had it not been painfully verified, again and

again, that every return to the simplicity of the gospel of Christ has always had its bitterest opponents in the champions of a narrow scholastic theology, and that, since the Pharisees condemned the Master himself, the "doctors of the law" have been the most impenetrable to any ray of light not contained in their own particular spectrum. That this statement is not too strong, the subsequent events will show.

A committee had been appointed to confer with Mr. Campbell, but he declined to meet it, partly on the ground that its appointment, under the circumstances, was contrary to the usual procedure in such matters, and partly on the ground of the rejection of the petition in his favor, which was, however, received at a subsequent meeting. At the next meeting of Presbytery, in May, the complainants were advised to turn their complaint into a "libel," and a Presbyterial visitation was appointed to hear Mr. Campbell preach at Row, on the 8th of July following. On this occasion he preached a truly evangelical sermon on the Beatitudes, which is before the writer. In it there occur the following two sentences, here given with as much of their context as space will allow: "He who knows Christ knows what sin is, having seen that God loves every child of Adam with a love the measure of which is the agony of his own Son." "The person who knows that Christ died for every human being is the person who is in a condition to go forth to every human being, and to say to every child of Adam, Let there be peace with you, — peace between you and your God, — for I can tell you that the Lord Jesus shed his blood for you." It will probably puzzle most modern readers to be told that of these two statements, the Presbytery recorded "their detestation and abhorrence." But it is ever "the truth" which "prevails;" and happily it is this then "abhorred" truth, of the forgiving love of God to every creature, which forms the very heart of the evangelical preaching of our own age; while the dogma of a Limited Atonement is, by the growing intelligence of the church, more and more relegated to the limbo of theological antiquities, as a slander on the love, and even the justice, of the Divine Father.

The libel was accordingly prepared, and served on Mr. Campbell in the following September. Printed with the answers of Mr. Campbell, the whole forms a thick pamphlet, which is before the writer, and affords, of course, the fullest statement of the question at issue. The libel bears that, "albeit the doctrine of universal atonement and pardon through the death of Christ, as

also the doctrine that assurance is of the essence of faith and necessary to salvation, are contrary to the Holy Scriptures, and to the Confession of Faith and Catechisms of the Church of Scotland," Mr. Campbell has "repeatedly promulgated and expressed the aforesaid doctrines from the pulpit or other places," etc. Very shortly before the next meeting of Presbytery, in the same month, Mr. Campbell found that he would have to give in his answers in writing. These, filling nearly sixty closely printed pages, he dictated to amanuenses in a little more than two days. They contain a most full and frank exposition of his views, which will best be understood if a few of the most representative passages are quoted.

On the question of the first two points, which in Mr. Campbell's teaching were merely two ways of presenting the *same* truth, he says, after reviewing the statements of Scripture: "On these grounds do I hold the doctrine of Universal Atonement to be the doctrine of Scripture, namely, that there is not one word pointedly or distinctly limiting the Atonement; that there are many expressions distinctly averring that the work of Christ had been for all men; that the footing on which the call to repentance is addressed to sinners is the manifested love of God in Christ to *them*," etc., etc. As to Universal Pardon, as to which his teaching had been seriously misrepresented, he says expressly that he does not use the word "pardon" in the sense of an act of indemnity to the sinner, giving him security from all the consequences of having sinned against God, irrespective of any condition as to moral character (a sense in which pardon has no existence with regard to *any*), nor as the reception of the returning sinner, which can, of course, be only for those who *do* return; but that he used it as meaning "*an act of God, referring to a sinner, by which he declares his having sinned to be no longer any barrier to his returning to the enjoyment of God's love and favor, making the consciousness of guilt to be no longer a just cause of fear in seeking the face of God; yea, giving the assurance that it is not only a righteous thing in God to receive him back into favor, not taking into account the sin justly chargeable against him, but even, so to speak, to help him back, and by his own Spirit to lift him up into the light of his own love and the enjoyment of his own holiness. In this sense I hold, and in this sense I teach, the doctrine of universal pardon through the death of Christ. For such a pardon I believe the Scriptures to reveal, as extended to all; as the results of the atoning sacrifice*

of Christ for all; as the fruit of his propitiation for the sins of the whole world; as the condition in which God's accepting the sacrifice of Christ for mankind has placed the children of men."

On the subject of Assurance, Mr. Campbell again carefully defines the sense in which he taught the assurance of faith, as *not* used by him in the sense of assurance of personal salvation, which a true Christian might lose for a time, though to a believer it seems to be implied in the larger truth of assurance of God's pardoning love. "On this subject," he says, "I hold and teach that, *in believing the gospel*, there is necessarily present in the mind the certainty that the person believing in it is the object of God's love, manifested to him in the gift of Christ, — the certainty that he has remission of his sins, the gift of the Spirit, and all things necessary pertaining to life and godliness, bestowed on him by the free grace of God, so that he feels himself debtor to God for the gift of eternal life; and this I hold to be of the essence of faith, that is to say, so necessarily implied in the existence of true faith that no person can be regarded as in the belief of God's testimony who is not conscious of it."

These full and clear explanations are quoted at some length because even *now* Mr. Campbell's teaching is often misconceived by those who take their information from mere *hearsay report*. To most intelligent Christians of to-day, all that is contained in the above paragraphs would seem to be implied in the simple clause of the Apostles' Creed, but, to the minds of Mr. Campbell's judges, — trained in all the metaphysical intricacy of Scottish Calvinistic theology, — it seemed far too simple to be true. It was, to a certain extent, the difference of meaning which they and Mr. Campbell attached to certain theological expressions which, notwithstanding all his explicit explanations, seemed to prevent them from receiving his real meaning. But it was also impossible that such teaching could either be comprehended or received by those who tenaciously held the dogma of a Limited Atonement. And those who know the effect and the history of the traditional theology of Scotland must admit that it had fostered a certain element of exclusiveness, not to say Pharisaism, which has been the bane of its religious life, and has often produced an opposition as bitter as that of the Jewish Pharisees to the truth that Christ was "the Saviour of *all* men."

Mr. Campbell in his answers, as well as his friend Mr. Story in defending him, had, in the first instance, appealed to Scripture

in support of his views, notwithstanding the protest of a reverend member of the Presbytery, who said: "*We are far from appealing to the Word of God on this ground: it is by the Confession of Faith that we must stand; by it we hold our livings!*" But he also proceeded to defend his position with reference to the Standards, on which ground he seemed more vulnerable, since several statements in the Confession of Faith, as well as in the Larger and the Shorter Catechism, seem to ordinary readers to *imply* the dogma of a Limited Atonement. In Mr. Campbell's opinion, however, they did not *necessarily* do so; and in what he says on this subject he is very much at one with recent opinions expressed in discussing the question of the revision of the Confession. "In reference to the doctrines in this Libel, declared to be inconsistent with the Standards of the church, I would reply as to the first, the doctrine of Universal Atonement and Pardon through the death of Christ, that the utmost that can be said in support of the charge is, that the present Confession of Faith is silent on the subject; but this, though it were fully admitted, would in truth be nothing on which to found. As to the second doctrine, that Assurance is of the essence of faith, it is substantially stated by the definition of Faith given; and the impression that it is otherwise has only arisen from confounding together the distinct subjects of *Assurance of Faith* and *Assurance of being in a state of salvation*. In respect of the first," he goes on to say, "I am aware that the peculiar use of the word '*redemption*,' though not altogether unsanctioned by Scripture usage, has occasioned the impression to exist very generally that the Universality of the Atonement is denied, and I shall now state my reasons for holding that to be a serious error." This he proceeded to do, both from a consideration of the passages so understood, and also from the history of the framing of the Confession of Faith, and its relation to former Confessions. In doing this, he makes an interesting reference to the fact that the Westminster Assembly was convoked, among other things, for the express purpose of "clearing the doctrine of the Church of England from false aspersions and interpretations, and that it would have been strangely inconsistent with such an object to have stated a doctrine so directly contrary to the received doctrine of the English Church as that of a Limited Atonement." Among other early authorities cited by Mr. Campbell in support of his teaching on the controverted points, he quotes the following very strong statement from Calvin's Catechism, used by the Church of Scotland, and approved

by her first Book of Discipline. The question is as follows: "What is required of us beside placing confidence in God, and having an assured confidence that He is Almighty and perfectly good?" To which the answer is: "That every one of us be fully assured in his conscience that he is beloved of God, and that He will be both his Father and Saviour." "*A right faith*" it further defines as "*a sure persuasion of God's tender love toward us*, according as He hath plainly uttered in his gospel, and that He will be both a Father and a Saviour unto us through the means of Christ." The Palatine Catechism, also recognized by the early Church of Scotland, is even more distinct on this point of individual assurance of God's forgiving love. He quotes, also, Patrick Hamilton, the first martyr in Scotland for the doctrines of the Reformation, as saying: "*And they that believe not that their sins are forgiven them, and that they shall be saved for Christ's sake, they believe not the gospel.*" It is quite clear, from his full quotations from these earliest Standards, that the dogma of the Limited Atonement, the real backbone of the opposition, had gradually corrupted the originally purer truth, — one of many instances of temporary retrogression in Christian belief, caused, no doubt, by the perpetual tendency of human nature to gravitate *downwards*.

Notwithstanding, however, all the considerations adduced by Mr. Campbell and his friend, Mr. Story, in vindication of the disputed doctrines, — considerations that might well have overcome everything save the invincible power of prejudice, — the "relevancy of the major proposition," that is, the heterodoxy of the doctrines specified, was affirmed by the majority, Mr. Story and one other forming a minority which dissented and appealed. The "counts" of proofs that Mr. Campbell had actually taught such doctrine were taken up at a subsequent meeting, and although Mr. Campbell explained that several of the statements reported as his were utter perversions of his teaching, and never made by him, the minor proposition was held "relevant." Among the witnesses examined on Mr. Campbell's side were several whose Christian intelligence and careful consideration of his teaching should have given them great weight with his judges. One of these was the American consul, Hervey Strong, and another was a cultivated Scottish advocate, who gave by far the clearest and most connected account of the doctrine he had preached. From the evidence of this witness alone, his friend, Mr. Story, "deemed it to be clearly enough made out that Mr. Campbell was con-

demned by the Presbytery, and afterwards by the Assembly, for doctrines that he did *not* hold." If any one will take the trouble of reading the outline of Mr. Hawkins's testimony, given chiefly in his own words, in the Life of Mr. Story, he will not only be convinced that the charge of Antinomianism preferred against Mr. Campbell was groundless, but he will see that the substance of Mr. Campbell's preaching was precisely that which we are accustomed to hear in the best evangelistic preaching of to-day. Of the results of this testimony Mr. Campbell seemed to be somewhat hopeful; for he wrote to his father, during the sitting of the Presbytery: "What may be the result of so many intelligent statements of what has been called the 'Row Heresy, given by many who were looked upon almost as mad, because of their interest in what was taught at Row, upon the court that now hears them, or on the higher courts, or on the church in general, when they are published, it is impossible to calculate. Even Dr. Hamilton (who had written a pamphlet against it) was obliged to confess that it was *not so bad a doctrine as he had supposed*." He could add that "every witness has been enabled to prove the honesty of my answers,—those for the prosecution as well as those for the defense." The evidence somewhat modified the tone of the Presbytery, and they agreed to postpone giving judgment until the case had been printed, so that they could peruse it at leisure. It was, however, a "foregone conclusion." On the 29th of March, 1831, the Presbytery found the libel "*proven*," by the former majority of eleven to two,—the dissenting minority, of course, appealing to the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, which met on the 14th of April, and came to no formal decision, and referred the matter to the approaching General Assembly, to be held, as usual, in Edinburgh, in the end of May. Mr. Campbell's able and comprehensive speech before this Synod, which occupied five hours in delivery, is somewhat unique in ecclesiastical controversy, from its deep spirituality, elevation, and Christian calmness of tone, and the self-forgetting enthusiasm which enabled him to lay stress on the truth he desired to commend to his brethren, rather than on his own personal relation to it, and to their verdict. It also was afterwards reprinted in pamphlet form, and is in the writer's possession. It is a very clear and spiritual exposition of his views,—*too* spiritual, doubtless, for the majority of those to whom it was addressed, even as the speaker was a minister of an uncommon type in Scotland at that time. It also gave an admirable presentation of the relation of a church to its Standards,—such

as is not so novel *now* as it was then. Throughout the whole controversy, Mr. Campbell, in common with his deeply interested friend, Mr. Erskine, had to bear the penalty — common to men greatly in advance of their age — of being misconceived and misconstrued; but they also shared the honor of being among the first to inaugurate a clearer vision and a higher tone of thought. To show the spirit of this speech a few sentences may be quoted, the first referring to the objection taken to the doctrine of a Universal Atonement, on the ground of the doctrine of Election: —

“Unless I can believe that things continually happen *against* the will of God, I can have no reason to believe that God is good or holy. I would, therefore, seek to bring men, when they oppose the doctrine that Christ died for all, to follow up their objections, and see that their whole difficulty resolves itself into a principle, which, if it were held consistently, would cause men to deny all moral character to God. I have never heard a word quoted from the book of God which it was even pretended was a positive limitation of the death of Christ, — and the difficulty expressed has been, not the authority of statements in the Word of God, saying that Christ has not died for all, but this, — that it was not easy to understand how God should love *all* and *some* should perish. Now, I say, let it be distinctly known what this amounts to, — let men know where they are going. It leads to this, that God has no moral character; that all events are alike pleasing to God; and the charitable man and the barbarous murderer are alike, according to God’s will. *It ends there, and nowhere else.*” And in reference to the attitude which a Christian church should take towards her own definition of truth, he says: “When the church says to both ministers and people, ‘This is my Confession of Faith; if anything in it appear to you inconsistent with the Word of God, I am prepared to go with you to the Word of God to settle the matter,’ then does the church speak according to her place. But if, instead of this, she says, ‘This I have fixed to be the meaning of the Word of God, and you cannot take any other meaning without being excluded from her communion; and to entitle me so to exclude you, I do not need to prove to you that what you hold and teach is contrary to the Scriptures; it is quite enough to say that it is contrary to my Confession of Faith,’ — I say, if the church use this language, she no longer remembers her place as the church. Is the Church of Scotland not bound by the principle now set forth? Does she regard herself as the church? and, if so, what constitutes her the church? What is

the inspired definition of the church? Not that she is a body formed by Act of Parliament, but that she is 'the pillar and ground of the truth.' "

We are growing towards this conception to-day; but that we have not yet generally attained to it is evident from too many needlessly vexatious prosecutions for "heresy." How far the spirit of Mr. Campbell's words is from being the spirit of the church even now is evinced by the fact that the General Assembly of a large Presbyterian Church on this continent, not long ago, went even farther than the Assembly which condemned Mr. Campbell, inasmuch as they excluded from their *communion* several earnest *lay*-Christians, because they held and freely expressed a view of Christian perfection almost identical with that of the saintly Wesley, but which the Assembly held to be incompatible with the language of the Confession. And this wrong, as not a few of the members of that church hold it to be, has never been righted, nor even publicly protested against even by those who have most been generally regarded as the champions of toleration. It is scarcely surprising, then, that Mr. Campbell's liberal view found no response, and that, notwithstanding his own and Mr. Story's addresses, and also that of his excellent counsel, who bore the now illustrious name of *Thomas Carlyle*, the speeches of the members of the Synod indicated anything rather than openness of mind and brotherly feeling. They were, in fact, actuated by that bitter animosity towards their blameless brother which is one of the most painful features of the whole case. One minister was "shocked at being 'bearded by the appellants' in defending their views," and added, with a curious naïveté, "I understand that there were some attempts to pray that we should be enlightened on the subject. The thing is perfectly shocking; there is nonsense on the face of it." Another clergyman spoke of the defender as "having polluted the whole country with his heresy," which had already been branded as "serpent doctrines." After the result in the Synod there was little to hope for in the Assembly. The prejudice and misconception had been growing and widening. Few took the trouble to examine the matter at first hand. There had been a "war of pamphlets," bitterly attacking Mr. Campbell, one having so far prejudiced the case as to stigmatize Mr. Campbell's teaching, in advance, as the "Row Heresy;" and though both Mr. Erskine and Mr. Story had worked valiantly with tongue and pen in his behalf, both were too much under the same condemnation to allow their efforts much weight in the mind eccle-

siastical. Moreover, other causes coöperated only to strengthen the prejudice. Rumors of Mr. Irving's extravagant views regarding the millennium, and of the strange manifestations afterwards known as the "gifts of tongues," — which first appeared in Mr. Story's parish in the vicinity of Row, and was most erroneously supposed to have been connected with the minister, Mr. Campbell, who *never indorsed them*, — seem to have caused a sort of panic as an "outbreak of heresy," which must be sternly suppressed. Dr. Chalmers, already the friend of Mr. Erskine, might have done much to avert the result, had he chosen to exert his great influence, but though he told Mr. Campbell that he "hoped he might be got through," he seems to have declined even to be a member of Assembly, and to have not even been in Edinburgh at the time of its meeting, maintaining a disappointing, Gallo-like attitude towards the matter. He was much absorbed at the time in his opposition to the Reform Bill, and in getting out his treatise on "Political Economy," and apparently he could not spare the time to master the merits of a case so intimately connected with the most vital doctrine of Christianity. His biographer tells us that, though "he was not an unmoved spectator," he "preserved an unbroken silence," and that on the very day when the Assembly was discussing the case, he wrote to a friend: "*It would have required a whole month to have mastered the recent authorship on these topics, and to have prepared myself for taking part in the deliberations of the Assembly in regard to them.*" It may seem strange that, having already read with "delight" Mr. Erskine's book on the "Freeness of the Gospel," containing views so identical with those of Mr. Campbell, he might not have been able to ascertain the latter with a less expenditure of time; but, at least, the members of Assembly generally did not share the modesty of his hesitation. Seldom has any case of such deep and solemn importance — involving the church's interpretation of the reference of the death of Christ — been disposed of with such rash and indecent haste. The *day* of the discussion was occupied with the *relevancy* of the Libel, that is, the question as to the heterodoxy of the doctrines specified. The evidence taken before the Presbytery — Mr. Campbell's answers, etc. — formed a volume of more than four hundred pages, which was supplied to the members for their perusal and, by most of them, Mr. Story tells us, "transferred to their pockets." When the evening sitting opened, only a minority of the members was present. Most of them, wearied with the day's discussion, had retired at its close.

believing that the case would not be proceeded with on that day. When, on returning next morning, they found out how hastily the matter had been concluded, one distinguished member indignantly said to the Moderator: "Why, sir, I should as soon have expected, on my return to this house, to find yourself deposed, as Mr. Campbell of Row!"

It was long after midnight when the merits of the case, as it concerned Mr. Campbell, were entered upon, and before the returning daylight it was hurriedly concluded, on the plea that the Assembly had such a press of business before them that it could not afford to waste more time on the case. The defenses and appeals were heard, and, as soon as the pleading was over, without further discussion, it was moved and seconded that Mr. Campbell be forthwith deposed from the ministry of the Church of Scotland. A milder resolution—that of suspension—was moved and seconded. Before the motions were put to the house, Mr. Campbell's aged father, himself a member of Assembly, addressed it in a touching speech, from which the following closing words are quoted:—

"You have heard Mr. Campbell this day, in his own defense, and he has told you that he just teaches that God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish; and with regard to Universal Pardon, he has told you that he just means by it 'that sinners may come to God, through Christ, as to a reconciled Father.' Now, I am sure, there is none among us all who has anything to say against this. And with regard to Assurance, sir, what he says is this, that a skeptic is not a Christian,—that doubting God is not believing Him. And I am sure, sir, that I never heard any preacher more earnestly and powerfully recommending holiness of heart and life. I do not stand here to deprecate your wrath. I bow to any decision to which you may think it right to come. Moderator, I am not afraid for my son. Though his brethren cast him out, the Master whom he serves will not forsake him, and while I live I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son."

Words so solemn and affecting might well have made even theologians pause before proceeding to an extreme step. But as soon as they had been uttered the vote was taken,—only 125 voting out of an Assembly of more than 300,—the sentence of deposition being carried by a majority of 119 to 6.

Many wrongs have been done in the name of religion, but it is

doubtful whether any more flagrant than this has been done in modern times by any Protestant church. We, in the clearer light of to-day, can see that the church was really guilty of the sin of *schism* in cutting off from her ministry so holy an apostle of the everlasting gospel. "Corporations," we are told, "have no souls," and the same seems often to be the case with church courts, in which, as Mr. Story remarked in this case, "men go in bodies like a flock of sheep." But the Nemesis which so surely follows wrong may visit a corporation as well as an individual. And with the solemn warnings addressed to the churches of the Apocalypse before us, it is not out of place to note that the very men most active and determined in prosecuting Mr. Campbell were also leaders in that great schism which only a few years later rent in twain the Church of Scotland, — a schism which, while overruled for good in external reforms and increased activity, yet, by the bitter and un-Christian animosity which it caused, retarded for many a day the leavening influence in Scotland of that gospel of love and peace of which John McLeod Campbell was so earnest and faithful a witness.

Agnes Maule Machar.

AN ORGANIZED REVIVAL AMONG THE YOUNG.

A HAPPY trend of the times is the tendency to manage Christian work by business methods, to introduce the plans of the counting-house and the factory, spiritualized and adapted to the work of Christ, into the church and her agencies. This tendency is especially seen in the training of the young and in all methods of Christian nurture. Earnest pastors have long felt the necessity of revivifying and quickening the young people's prayer-meeting, of setting the young people at work as soon as they come into the Christian life, of utilizing their force and energy in all its freshness and vigor.

The early months of the Christian life have been truly considered to be the most critical. It takes but few weeks to set the mortar. When the twig has been bent for a little while the tree is inclined for a lifetime of Christian activity or religious indifference. These facts have been felt with increasing power by the ministers of the present generation, and there has been a strong and growing desire to solve the problems which these facts impose.

For years questions of Christian nurture have been uppermost in all ecclesiastical assemblies. "How to win the Children for Christ," "How to train the Boys and Girls," "How to lead the Young Men and Women into the Kingdom," — these have been questions which, in one form or another, have engaged the attention of almost every conference and council for the last score of years. They simply indicate the direction of thought and the conditions of religious life which were pressing themselves upon the attention of pastors and Christian workers.

The Christian Endeavor Society in its beginning was a humble attempt to solve these pressing problems. They weighed upon the heart of a pastor in Portland, in common with a multitude of others, some eleven years ago. Many young people had been brought into the kingdom and had given good evidence of being Christ's disciples. He greatly desired that they should not be drones in the church hive, but active workers. His experience in bringing young people into the church in previous years had not been altogether hopeful. Few of them had lived up to their church covenant, and there seemed to be very little help in the economy of the church for the development of their Christian life. To be sure there was the preaching service, which they could attend, the Sunday-school, and the mid-week prayer-meeting. They had also the young people's prayer-meeting, which sometimes in the glow of revival interest reached summer heat, but which during a good portion of the year was registered by the prayer-meeting thermometer as not very far from freezing point. It was an average young people's meeting, but was attended by comparatively few, for the most part those called "young people" by courtesy. It was not a vital part of the church life. Other plans were tried, such as a pastor's catechetical class, a Pilgrim's Progress Band, a "Mizpah Circle" for missionary effort, and many such devices to interest and hold the young people to the heart of the church.

These plans, however, were only measurably successful. There seemed to be some binding force lacking in all these methods. There was little *staying power* about them. While they were fresh and new they seemed to be helpful, but as soon as they lost their novelty they lost their power over the hearts of the young Christians. How to supply this element of continued and consecrated interest and attractiveness caused many anxious hours on the part of that pastor, and the solution which he found for these difficulties he called the "Young People's Society of Christian

Endeavor of the Williston Church." The underlying features of this new organization were the prayer-meeting pledge, the consecration service, and the lookout committee. The prayer-meeting pledge, it was hoped, would give stability to the young people's prayer-meeting, by making it not a spasmodic thing dependent upon the weather, the moods of the young people, and their religious temperature for the time being, but a meeting of continuous power, where the word "duty" would be substituted for the word "feeling;" a meeting which the young people would attend because it was right to attend it, and because such a meeting was necessary to their religious growth; because they had promised to attend it, rather than because they felt just like it at the moment.

But if there was to be a pledge, it must be kept. A disregarded pledge would be worse than none. A promise taken only to be broken would deaden the sense of honor in the young Christian's heart. It could hardly be expected that all these young Christians could be safely left to themselves in time of temptation or religious indifference to remember and fulfill their obligations, so the Lookout Committee was the natural sequence of the pledge. It was the duty of this committee to see that those who joined the society as active members understood the pledge and signed it knowing what they were doing, and also to see that they kept it when they had signed it. But how, among so large a number of young people, could the Lookout Committee know who were faithful and who were not? A general observance of, and acquaintance with, the habits of members could tell them much about this, but at the consecration meeting, which was to be held once a month, something more could be known than in any other way in regard to the faithfulness or unfaithfulness of the young disciples. At this meeting the roll was to be called, and each one must respond to it in some way. If he were absent, the Lookout Committee was to find out the reason for his absence, and if willfully persistent in disregarding his covenant obligations with the society, his name was to be dropped from the roll after three consecutive absences from these consecration meetings. This dropping out of the society was not to be considered, and has never been considered, in the light of excommunication from a church, nor was moral opprobrium attached to it.

Any one can leave the society at any time when he feels that his duty is elsewhere, or that he does not need the influences of the organization. His own request, if he has a good reason, is sufficient to take his name from the roll, nor can he long be unfaith-

ful to his vows and remain an active member of the society. Thus the society is constantly kept free from drones, and the active membership is not only active in name, but in deed, and the pledge becomes something more than a formula, it becomes a necessity to membership.

Although very much is made of the prayer-meeting, the Society of Christian Endeavor is not merely a prayer-meeting society. It has been sneeringly called this by some persons who have not understood its scope and mission. We have seen no reason to resent this insinuation, for if it had only rejuvenated the young people's prayer-meeting and accomplished nothing else, it could not be said to have been born in vain.

But its outreach is much greater than the prayer-meeting. There is no department of church work among young people which it is not meant to strengthen and revivify. This particular work it accomplishes through the committees, which are an essential feature in a Christian Endeavor Society. It gives every man his work. It divides the religious tasks of the young people and places them upon many shoulders. It increases the responsibility which each one feels for some particular branch of the church work. Frequently, a debilitating influence of organization is that it takes the sense of responsibility from individual shoulders, and centres it upon the organization as such. The Christian Endeavor Society attempts to remedy this evil by insisting in every way upon *individual*, personal responsibility. The calling of the roll at the consecration meeting emphasizes this. The dividing of the societies into committees of five, for different branches of work, adds to the emphasis. The monthly written reports, which are required of each committee, plainly indicate that they are appointed for some particular purpose, and that they are negligent of a duty to which they are called and chosen of God, as well as man, unless they have a worthy account to give of their stewardship. The importance of the Lookout Committee, of the Prayer-Meeting Committee, and of the Social Committee cannot be overestimated. The former has a most delicate task committed to it, of keeping the members of the society true to their covenant obligations, so far as any outside influence can thus keep them true. Its duties have already been explained to some extent. The Prayer-Meeting Committee has for its duty to make in every way the very most of the young people's prayer-meeting, to promote faithfulness to the pledge, and in conjunction with the Lookout Committee to provide topics and leaders for the meeting, and should

never rest satisfied until the young people's meeting has reached the highest point of efficiency and practical value. The Social Committee has for its duty the large task of making the young people acquainted one with another, and especially the responsibility of bringing the "wall flowers" out of their chosen obscurity. In addition to these committees, which are essential to every society, almost any amount of work can be undertaken by the Sunday-school, Temperance, Missionary, Relief, Calling, Flower, and Good Literature committees, whose very names indicate the purpose of their existence.

When we look upon the history of these past eleven years, it is not a difficult matter to understand why the movement has been blessed of God. Very little human wisdom is found in the beginnings of the society or in its development. It has been led of God, and has gone into all parts of the earth because sent by God. If we inquire reverently why it has been blessed, I think we shall find that it is largely because it is a spiritual organization, because it has dared to say to the young people, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness;" because it has been uncompromising in its call to duty; because it has attempted always to raise the spiritual standard of the lives of the young people higher and higher; because it has made of their religion not one thing among a great many others, but THE one important and preëminent thing.

Again, the movement has been blessed by Divine Providence because it seeks to promote intelligent religious service. Any one who has much to do with young people realizes how much ill-directed effort is largely put forth. How many are disappointed in their efforts to do the Master's work simply because they do not adapt their means to the ends to be gained, because they do not summon their resources and bring their intellects to the front, but believe that Divine Providence will take care of the church and her affairs, however foolishly they may be conducted. I received a letter not long ago, proposing that the Christian Endeavor societies have for their mission: 1st. To provide for the poor and destitute people of our great cities. 2d. To relieve the famine-stricken people of Russia. 3d. To provide a national fund to be used, in case of another European war, for the needs of widows and orphans who might be made so by the war; and 4th, to provide a home on Gethsemane for all the outcast and downcast and wretched on the face of the earth. That was the little plan which my correspondent had in mind, and he closed his letter, as such people almost always close their letters, by saying, "Who knows but what the Christian

Endeavor Society has come to the Kingdom for just such a time as this." Such an absolutely impractical and absurd scheme shows a good heart and a weak brain. This young man had spent all his fortune in printing circulars, and in trying to push this scheme upon the public. How much his energy, and that of thousands like him, might accomplish, if discretion, wisdom, and energy were well united!

It is the hope of the Christian Endeavor movement to increase the intellectual application of business principles to the service of Christ. Every society is a manual or industrial training-school. Every junior society is a kindergarten for religious training. Every committee is a class-room for some practical branch of religious work. Every prayer-meeting is a school for expression or confession of Christ.

Again, we can fairly say that the society has been prospered as it has because the young people belonging to it are so winsome in the exhibition of their religious lives. There is nothing long-faced or melancholy about their whole-hearted service for Christ. There is no audience more inspiring from the very winsomeness of those gathered together than a great Christian Endeavor convention. Moreover, I believe that this earnest service in which the young people are engaged is doing very much to solve perplexing questions of doubtful amusements and matters of Christian casuistry, which are continually giving the young disciples so much trouble. "I will delight myself within thy statutes," says the Psalmist. These young disciples have found that there is plenty of room within the statutes of God for all that makes life worth living, without resorting to the public saloon, the card-table, or the low theatre for their enjoyment.

Once more, the spirit of loyalty involved in the fundamental features of the movement constitutes a reason why it has been so eminently prospered. The following is the pledge to which allusion has already been made more than once in this article. "Trusting in the Lord Jesus Christ for strength, I promise Him I will strive to do whatever He would like to have me do; that I will make it the rule of my life to pray and read the Bible every day, and to support my own church in every way, especially by attending all her Sunday and mid-week services, unless prevented by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Saviour, and that, just so far as I know how, throughout my whole life, I will endeavor to lead a Christian life. As an active member I promise to be true to all my duties, to be present at and to take

some part aside from singing in every Christian Endeavor prayer-meeting, unless hindered by some reason which I can conscientiously give to my Lord and Master. If obliged to be absent from the monthly consecration meeting of the society I will, if possible, send at least a verse of Scripture to be read in response to my name at the roll call." Those who examine this pledge will see that in every part it is simply a promise of loyalty to some duties which are naturally incumbent upon every young Christian. First, that of private devotion involved in daily reading the Bible and prayer; second, the duty of supporting one's own church; and third, the duty of publicly confessing Christ before men. When the pledge is analyzed it will be seen that these three obligations are fundamental and essential, that these are the only ones, and that each one is a thought of loyalty to a genuine religious duty.

Lastly, the history of these eleven years makes it evident that the movement has been blessed as it has because it affords room for so much of genuine brotherhood and fellowship between the denominations. The young people of the different sects which have entered so heartily into the Christian Endeavor movement can never look askance at each other in the future. The thought of a quarrel between denominations that are here largely represented seems quite out of the question among those who are now the young people of our churches, for they have come to know each other better, to learn each other's ways, and to see that the children of God are found in every fold that acknowledges the one Shepherd. The Christian Endeavor movement, without weakening their fidelity to their own church and denomination, has broadened their outlook and vastly quickened their love one for another. The old hymn that the churches have been singing for so many years, —

"Blest be the tie that binds
Our hearts in Christian love,"

has come to mean something to hundreds of thousands of disciples that it has never meant before. In thirty different denominations is the movement making rapid headway. In most of them it is practically the only young people's society. It has bound the hearts of the young disciples in this country to the hearts of those in other lands, not only where the common English tongue is spoken, but to those in all foreign lands where our missionaries have gone. It has quickened the interest of the young people in every missionary enterprise, as the very numerous contributions, which every missionary board acknowledges from Christian En-

deavor societies, indicate. It has emphasized the idea that in the republic of God are found all those who love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity.

It is no exaggeration to say that nearly a million young people are looking forward to the great convention which will be held next July in New York with eager interest. At least 25,000 of them anticipate being present at this convention, and all will feel the impetus of the great gathering. Their older friends, pastors, and teachers, who are able to be present on that occasion, as they see the solid ranks of young men and women from all parts of the country, who have come together for this purely religious gathering, and for the stimulus and uplift which it will give, will go away from Madison Square Garden, I believe, convinced that the gospel of Christ is not losing its hold upon the young people of the present generation; that to be a Christian never meant so much as it means now; that in the best sense of the word the religion of Christ, with its confessions and its sacrifices, its self-denial and its heroism, was never so popular as it is to-day; and that the prophecy of Isaiah was never so near fulfillment: "Fear not; for I am with thee: I will bring thy seed from the east, and gather thee from the west: I will say to the north, give up; and to the south, keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth."

Francis E. Clark.

AUBURNDALE, MASS.

REALITY IN THE PULPIT.

REALITY is nowhere greater than in the pulpit. It is nowhere more essential. The power of the pulpit is the presence of reality. The weakness of the pulpit is the absence of reality. Instinctively, men recognize its presence and respond to its power whether or not they can tell whence it is; on the other hand, men are no less quick to feel its absence and to detect its weakness, even though they cannot explain what is the matter. A preacher may or may not possess resources of culture and gifts of speech, but if his preaching has the charm of reality men will listen to him. "Let a man be a true preacher, really uttering the truth through his own personality, and it is strange how men will gather to listen to him."¹

¹ Phillips Brooks's *Lectures on Preaching*.

And at no time has the demand for reality in the pulpit been more insistent than it is to-day. The authority of the scribes and Pharisees is not revered; the robe of the priest is not regarded; the odor of sanctity will not do; the personality of the *man* alone wins the respect of men; reality therefore is the preacher's sceptre, — the only insignia of royalty that command unquestioning homage. Men want *real* preaching, and they know when they have it.

Confident as I am that reality is the essential quality, "the inexorable condition of preaching," I attempt to define it with diffidence. It is not a simple matter to analyze primary elements; it is always easier to say what they are not than to define what they are. In speaking of reality, one appreciates with a keener sympathy the embarrassment of the schoolboy who defined salt as "that which makes a potato taste bad when there ain't any on it," — not an exact definition, perhaps, and yet profoundly true! Reality, like salt, is most obvious when it is not present, and nowhere is its absence more painfully apparent than in the pulpit, for reality is the *salt* of preaching.

1. A dreary sense of unreality sometimes steals over the preacher in his work; he is dealing with "things unseen:" with God and the laws of his spiritual kingdom, with man and the needs of his spiritual being, — are they eternal, *are* they real? He often declares that the things unseen are eternal and more real than the things seen and temporal, indeed, that the former constitute the only reality; but he would not be mortal man if he did not sometimes let slip his own sense of their reality, and wonder if after all sermons are not "of such stuff as dreams are made on." He cannot always keep feeling attuned to expression, and expression exactly commensurate with conviction. If he is a sensitive man of somewhat mobile temperament, he will be startled and shocked sometimes to find himself saying what he is sure he does not feel, and is not sure that he believes. He is preaching because Sunday morning has come and he is in the pulpit. As a messenger, he cannot have an invariable imperative, or, as a herald, a constant joy; he cannot know much of the results of his work. Is it strange that he is sometimes overwhelmed by a dreary sense of its unreality? And then he seeks relief from this stultifying consciousness by reaching after something tangible, until he can say, Here is something which at least I am sure of, — something I can make real to others. It may be some commonplace of ethics, a social obligation, or an individual sin; it has

grown out of his experience and observation, and, so far as it goes, is real. In preaching this, he finds a certain sort of reality, but he knows that it is not the reality of preaching. It is not enough that a sermon be true; it is its element of *revealed* truth which makes it a sermon. A sermon has to do with spiritual facts and forces, and there can be no greater mistake than to suppose that spiritual preaching is opposed to real preaching. The fact is — and in his heart of hearts the preacher knows it — preaching is most real when it is most spiritual. A sermon has reality as a sermon when it wakens the spirit of man with the sensation of Jacob's dream: "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not!" The great preachers have been the spiritual preachers, — men who have ushered the soul into the very presence of God, making the things unseen and eternal, luminous and real. "With all the sordidness of our time," says a great living preacher, "the preachers that have been the most powerful have been the most spiritual." Obviously, then, the sense of reality in preaching can be recovered only by a clearer vision and a firmer grasp of spiritual verities; the preacher who seeks reality by preaching something else, however true, will not find the reality of preaching. He is seeking the right thing, but he is not seeking it in the right way. He is true to the preacher's instinct, but he can never satisfy it with anything unworthy of itself.

"Our preachers having got rid of the Christian doctrines by means of the higher criticism, wrote Dr. Tholuck ¹ to Dr. Pusey, are now insisting with much earnestness upon the importance of taking regular exercise." This bit of fine irony, I hardly need add, does not describe real preaching. I do not mean that a preacher may not seek reality with healthful and wholesome relief, after breathing the rarer atmosphere of spiritual heights, by treading some path of common experience, still less that the true preacher has nothing to do with the common things of a man's daily interests, and of man's relation to man, — not at all. I am only saying, what I believe the experience of every preacher confirms, that abiding reality and deep satisfaction in preaching is found only when he stands and speaks with something of the prophet's "Thus saith the Lord." The real preacher is the prophet, that is, one who speaks *forth*, *for* God, who interprets God. He may find occasional relief for himself and much edification for his hearers in discussing current events and what not, but as a minister of the Word he cannot find profound satisfaction

¹ Quoted by Liddon in his *Elements of Religion*.

in preaching everything except the Word; he will therefore seek reality more and more by seeking to preach the Word more and more largely. His only refuge from the dreadful sense of unreality is not in abandoning the spiritual world, but by clinging, with whatever hold he has upon it, the more tenaciously. When he has gotten hold of some truth of Revelation with so firm a grasp that it has become his own, when he gives it to men with the firm conviction that it is God's, so that he can say, "What I am saying is God's word and God's will, I speak from God" — then does not the preacher find reality in his work? Only as a man speaks out of the direct, intimate personal apprehension of spiritual truth, and not as the scribes, will he know what it is to preach; for real preaching is speaking *from God*.

2. But real preaching is also speaking *to men*. It is not enough that what he says is true of God, he must make it real to men. It is the preacher's business to make connection between truth and life. It is not enough, therefore, that the sermon corresponds to some revealed truth; it must come into touch with actual life. If the sermon fails to make this connection, it fails utterly as a sermon, whatever else it may be. Real preaching will find some point of contact with real life. It will, to borrow Coleridge's vigorous word, *find* men. The startled question: "Whence knowest thou me?" is the best compliment a preacher can receive. A sermon upon any text or theme, however remote it seems from a practical purpose, will save itself from littleness and unreality by reaching out for the broader relations of common experience; by touching some fundamental chord of human nature, some primary feeling of the heart. And whenever the preacher succeeds in finding one of these chords which responds to the simplest touch, and thrills with the universal melody, then he has the charm and the power of reality, and however simple, he is really great. It is essential, then, to reality —

(1.) That the preacher know men; not only man, but men, real men. And he needs to know them well. He may or may not study the characters of Shakespeare, but he must know the folks in his own parish. He ought to know what they are thinking about, and what they are doing, from one week's end to another. Is he speaking to real men and women, to real boys and girls? So far as his sermons portray human action and experience, do they reflect the life and inner motive of the hearer so faithfully and vividly that he sees as in a mirror his own image? It is such accurate and searching knowledge of men that gives the

impression of reality. He who spoke as never man spake knew what was in man. But many a sermon of ours lacks reality because it is not the complement of any real need; it does not correspond to any actual experience; it does not answer any living question; it does not satisfy any flickering aspiration; it does not fit into anybody's *life*. I think it is Thomas Hughes who said of the second Bishop of Manchester, who selected his residence in the heart of the busy, smoky city in preference to the quiet, picturesque country-seat occupied by his predecessor, that although his lordship was a keen lover of nature, yet "Humanity was his blue sky."

Akin to this love of human nature is interest in the actual and present life of men in the world. A recent writer declares that the church has thrown around the Christian religion an "other-worldliness" which has depreciated it in the judgment of matter-of-fact men of the counting-room, the shop, and the factory; whatever advantage may accrue to the believer in distant ages beyond the grave, they are in the habit of looking for immediate returns. Practical in every other concern of life, they want a religion that has some relation to things seen and temporal. This is no contradiction of our statement that men respond to spiritual preaching. Christ spoke of eternal life as present rather than future. The real preacher will be characterized by an intense this-worldliness. "A man's study should be everywhere, in the house, in the streets, in the fields, and in the busy haunts of men."¹ And this leads us to emphasize a kindred element of reality.

(2.) An earnest, practical purpose gives reality to a sermon. Men are quick to detect the tone of preaching. They like what they call "practical sermons." (What preacher has not been humiliated by the popular reversal of his own estimate of his work? The great sermon fell flat, and great was the fall of it; while the unassuming sermon, — plain, simple, and direct, — though its author took small account of it, was so gratefully and so unduly honored!) Men like practical sermons, they do not like what they term "doctrinal preaching." When they see that the preacher evidently cares more for his truth than for their life; when the proposition is evidently dearer to him than the conclusion, the sermon fails, and it ought to fail. There is, of course, no real opposition between the practical and the doctrinal, but rather a vital relation; to every truth belongs its duty, and every duty

¹ Beecher's *Yale Lectures on Preaching*.

has its sanction of truth. And yet the common instinct which condemns so-called doctrinal preaching is right in the main, though it does not accurately define what it condemns. "When I begin to tell men about Christ as if that they should know the truth about Him, and not that they should become what knowing the truth about Him would help them to be, do I begin to preach doctrine in the wrong way, which men are trying to describe when they talk about doctrinal teaching?"¹ There is an old gentleman who rarely fails to felicitate his pastor on the fact that he no longer hears the doctrines of the Trinity, the Atonement, etc., proclaimed from the pulpit! If, as I would believe, what he really means is, that he is no longer beaten from the pulpit with the butt end of a dogma,—if the anatomy of theology is taught only for the sake of the hygiene of Christianity, and if he does not see the articulation of the sermon—skeleton because it is clothed in flesh and blood,—well and good. But if it is really true that the sermon of to-day has no bone and sinew of Christian doctrine, it may well be questioned how much occasion there is for congratulation.

(3.) The preacher may know men, may have a quick sympathy with them, may speak to them with a practical purpose, and yet fail of making the vital connection between the truth and the life, because these elements of reality are lost in more or less degree in the medium of communication. An air of unreality often envelops the sermon because of something utterly unnatural and unreal in the form of expression.² There is, for example, much in the way of illustration that only succeeds in producing an impression of unreality, because it is so remote from the common experience. The preacher goes to ancient history for his heroes, and betrays greater familiarity with mythology than with common life. He deals with the exceptional and the unusual more often than with the average and the familiar. His good and bad men are taken from public life or from the stage; his Dives is richer by far, and his Lazarus more abjectly poor, than anybody in the community. "It is so much easier," as George Eliot says,

¹ Phillips Brooks's *Lectures on Preaching*.

² I must quote a delicious bit of homiletics from Miss Slosson's *Fishin' Jimmy*:—

"I thought I 'd jest see what this man 'd preach about, an' I settled down to liss'n to the sarm'n. But there wa'n't no sarm'n; not what I 'd been raised to think was the on'y true kind. There wa'n't no heads, no fustlys nor sec'ndlys, nor sin'ly bruthrins, but the first thing I knowed I was hearin' a story, an' 't was a fishin' story."

"to say that a thing is *black*, than to discriminate the particular shade of brown, blue, or green to which it really belongs." But if one would paint from nature, it is necessary to distinguish natural shades and mix your paints with fidelity, even at the sacrifice of striking effects. When the dramatic incident, suggesting a book of sermon-illustrations, abounds, and the homely figure, implying a keen eye and a warm heart, is rare, the sermon has the artistic effect of a chromo. When the preacher revels in the grandeur of the distant Alps, which no one of his hearers perhaps ever saw, and overlooks the quieter beauty of the neighboring hills, dear as they are to those born under their shadow, he gains nothing in reality; when the thunder of the inevitable Niagara reverberates from the pulpit which is deaf to the melody of the mill-stream, singing by the door, nothing is gained in power. In the single matter of illustration the preacher has much to learn from his Master. Who has not felt the Master's skill in illustration; how beautifully and deftly the common and familiar is woven into his public speech? His marvelous parables are the vivid pictures of homely occupations, in which we see the sower, the shepherd, or the housewife. The wedding-feast, the market-place, and the vineyard are common scenes in the play of his thought; the growing grain, the lily of the field, the birds of the air, are familiar figures. What a charm of reality these life-like forms must have given to his speech! — a charm that does not fail for us to whom the Oriental setting is less familiar.

In listening to public speech, has the reader never felt the great force that lies in a homely word, a familiar illustration, aptly and handily introduced? The philosophy of it is not far to seek: —

"We're so made that we love

First, when we see them painted, things we've passed

Perhaps a thousand times, nor cared to see."¹

3. When old Lisbeth retorted: "Ay, ay, that's the way wi' thee: thee allays makes a peek o' thy own words out o' a pint o' the Bible's," she may have thought that Seth Bede would make an excellent commentator, but she certainly did not describe a good preacher. A sermon is more than a multiplication of the words of the text; the preacher is more than an automatic mouth-piece of the truth. "The truth must come really through the person, not merely over his lips, not merely into his understand-

¹ See Stalker's *Imago Christi*, chapter, Christ the Preacher.

ing and out through his pen. It must come genuinely through him!"¹ The preacher's message may be true; it may be a practical truth; but it will never have the charm of reality and the power to move others until it is real to himself, and the fact that the truth he declares is real to him is the secret of his power to make it real to others. "Truth through personality is our description of real preaching."² "Preaching is the truth plus the man."

The question is frequently raised, whether the place of the pulpit is a permanent one among the changing conditions of modern life? A current religious periodical has sought replies to the query, "Is it worth while to go on preaching?" and an editorial in a Boston daily paper, which lies before me as I write, discusses jauntily the decline in the "Response to Preaching." But all such questions and discussions overlook the vital fact of *personality* in its connection between truth and life; truth is transmuted into life only through personality; once let a truth find utterance through a genuine personality, how men will listen! It is the divine law of Inspiration and Revelation, the way God has chosen to make truth real to men, and it is a way that will not become obsolete so long as man is man. We need have no fear that the eternal principle of the Incarnation is being superseded by the activity of the modern printing-press. The only occasion for anxiety is when the truth ceases to be real to the preacher, for then, and only then, will it fail of becoming real to other men.

Just here many a conscientious preacher is met by a problem: "I am a preacher of the gospel," he says, "and as such I have a certain message to deliver, with a definite content; but there are some parts of this message, constituent and important, I doubt not, which, nevertheless, have little or no reality for me; shall I attempt to preach these?" This is indeed a serious question, and under certain circumstances may become a trying and painful one; but I think there is no doubt of the true answer. It is really a question of choice between symmetry and sincerity, and there can be no hesitation in choosing sincerity at the cost of symmetry. It may very rightly become a question whether I can preach the gospel at all, but it can never be a question with me *what* of the gospel I shall preach, for I can really preach only that which is real to *me*. So long as I know in part, I must prophesy in part, and it is a great comfort when one is keenly conscious how inadequately he is preaching, that even St. Paul said: "So,

¹ Phillips Brooks's *Lectures on Preaching*.

² *Ibid.*

as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel." So, I am required to preach only "as much as in me is"? Yes! thank God for Paul's measure of duty! And, sooner or later, the preacher will learn for himself not only that he is not expected to preach more than is in him, but that it is useless to attempt it; nay, strictly speaking, he *cannot*, — he cannot give what he does not possess.

But this thought has a more inspiring side; not only is it true that the preacher cannot make real to others more than is real to himself, but it is certain that in preaching *a* truth which is most real to himself, he is giving the fullest expression to *the* truth. "A preacher can, if he will, declare the truth, but not the whole truth, or rather the whole truth will best get a hearing through him as he preaches that truth most real to him, with all his might. Mere completeness is only another name for the commonplace."

I have heard of a preacher of no unusual gifts, who nevertheless wields a very unusual power. His sermons are exercising a wider influence than their rhetorical merits justify; his words carry great weight; and the reason assigned for this rare power is, that throughout the years of his long pastorate he has been scrupulous to say nothing he does not thoroughly believe; but is not that reason enough? Such a course might narrow the scope of a man's preaching, but it must deepen its power. Let a man speak out of the living experience and apprehension of truth, and his words will be endowed with power, confined by no limitations of talent or culture; the fire of reality breaks through disguises, shines out of idiosyncrasy, transfigures awkwardness, and kindles conviction. In the long run, reality is an exact criterion of a preacher's influence, the law of his duty, and the reach of his power. Peter's words to the lame man at the gate of the temple are the measure of both the obligation and the influence of every preacher: "What I have, that give I thee."

Our imperfect description of reality in the pulpit is done; to gather up our thought in fewest words: *real preaching is speaking from God, to men, through the man.*

Charles H. Cutler.

BANGOR, ME.

THE GREEK QUESTION AT CAMBRIDGE.

SELDOM has the scholastic world of England been more deeply stirred by the reappearance of an old, old question than in the past few months. The war was neither new nor unexpected; fought out with old weapons and time-honored tactics, it has excited a greater interest than ever before. Scarcely a new argument has been advanced on either side, and yet the conflict could hardly have waged more hotly, nor to a more decisive issue. Here, we have barely known of the fray; even Oxford was a mere spectator, unmoved by the struggle at Cambridge, —

*"Suave etiam belli certamina magna tueri
Per campos instructa, tua sine parte pericli."*

In this, its most recent form, the Greek question owes its main impulse to a meeting of the headmasters of the "public schools" at Oxford in December, 1890. It is not that the headmasters pretend to dictate to the universities, although they have been accused of something akin to dictation. At all events, the whole controversy shows how great the reflex influence of the schools upon the universities has become. Against the motion of the headmaster of Harrow (Dr. Welldon), the headmasters expressed themselves by a vote of thirty-one to twenty-nine in favor of retaining Greek in the requirements for the Previous Examination. That the heads of the leading schools should be nearly equally divided upon a question affecting the foundations of classical education is a fact both interesting and suggestive, — interesting, in view of the standing of most of these masters as classical scholars of more or less repute; suggestive, because never has a company of masters shown a greater desire to adapt requirements to the tastes and needs of the day. Such a display of radicalism in a conservative stronghold could not fail to attract the public attention.

The University of Cambridge has, in recent years, more than once inquired into the expediency of a change in the requirements, by which Greek should be removed from the list of subjects prescribed for the Previous Examination, — a test corresponding to our entrance examination, though taken, not before the beginning of the first term, but as a rule in the third. With reference to this examination, a commission, or "syndicate," was appointed for the same purpose in 1870 and in 1878. The deliberations of the latter "syndicate," of which the late Dr. Kennedy was a member,

lasted a year and a half. Dr. Kennedy himself admitted that the retention of Greek as a compulsory subject excludes from the University many able and industrious men eminently qualified to derive the utmost advantage from a university training. In 1890 the Greek question was again considered by a similar board, this time in its bearing upon the General Examination. In the present instance also the proposal was simply to appoint a board of inquiry, to weigh and examine certain alleged new facts and statistics, as presented by the opponents of Greek. This preliminary question was brought before the Senate of the University by the General Board of Studies, in the form of a motion or "grace," 1st, authorizing the appointment of a "syndicate," to "consider whether it be expedient to allow alternatives for one of the two classical languages in the Previous Examination, either to all students or to any classes of students other than those already exempted;"¹ 2d, constituting the "syndicate" of certain names. Upon this proposal the Senate was convened to decide. It was claimed by many who were with the radical party on the proposition to inquire, but not of it on the main point, that this preliminary action could but cause a new and more thorough investigation, leaving the ultimate question unprejudiced. To lead the opposition to this "grace" a strong executive committee was appointed. Among its membership we find the following (all of those named being also members of the General Board of Studies, except Professor Mayor and Mr. Glaisher): —

Dr. Charles Taylor, Master of St. John's, Professors H. B. Swete, (Divinity), R. C. Jebb (Greek), G. F. Browne (Archæology), J. E. B. Mayor (Latin), W. Robertson Smith (Arabic), Messrs. J. W. L. Glaisher (Mathematics), W. L. Mollison (Mathematics), R. A. Neil (Sanskrit).

An appeal from this executive committee sets forth the following arguments:² (1) that, should the Greek requirement be abolished, Greek would cease to be taught in all but the largest schools, and would accordingly become a luxury of the rich; (2) that no study is known which can be considered a worthy substitute; (3) the unique importance of Greek in connection with literary and scientific work is such that its loss would make itself felt in every profession, especially the church; (4, *a*) the introduction of so many new subjects is no reason for the change, since

¹ Natives of Asia not of European parentage may present certain work done in English as an equivalent for the prescribed Greek.

² *London Mail*, October 23, 1891.

the aim of education is to educate the mind rather than to fill it with facts; (*b*) the argument that the Greek requirement is so small as to be of no value would apply equally well to all other requirements; even an elementary knowledge of Greek has a value, for it may be taken up again by any one who has made a beginning; (*c*) the hardship to the class of students for whom the change is especially desired would not compare with the loss to the University; (*d*) the growth of the science school at Cambridge in ten or twelve years shows that the interests of science do not require the change; (5) the discussion of 1870, 1878, and 1889 is sufficient for the present.

The Master of Trinity (Dr. H. M. Butler) declared¹ that the change seemed to him desirable on the ground that there is strong evidence — which, however, needs sifting — that an increasing number of boys do not study Greek, while at the same time receiving in the “modern side” an education which is essentially liberal, so that they are often really better educated than many of the passmen at the universities. At least, “inquiry is not necessarily surrender,” and is in accordance with the general policy of the University.

A few days later² a radical proclamation appeared over the signatures of such men as Cayley, G. Darwin, Gwatkin, Maitland, Seeley, H. Sidgwick, Jackson, Reid, Verrall, A. Sedgwick, Sir G. Paget, urging that the demand for inquiry should not be stifled; the development of “modern sides” had gone on rapidly since the report of a syndicate eleven years ago proposed to relieve candidates for honors of the obligation to study both Latin and Greek, on the ground of the exclusion of “a number of able and industrious students educated in schools in which Greek is not taught, or in modern departments of classical schools.”

The heads of the medical faculty (the late Sir George Paget and others) also issued a manifesto at the same time,³ appealing to their former pupils to come up to Cambridge and vote for the “grace;” while the headmasters’ view is represented by a letter from Dr. Welldon,⁴ who thinks the question to be decided is “not so much whether Greek shall be retained as a compulsory subject for all or the majority of students, but whether the course of modern education, which now affects half the boys in the public schools, shall be controlled by the great Universities, or by bodies of less culture and position.”

¹ *Mail*, October 23.

² *Ib.*, October 28.

³ *Ib.*, October 28.

⁴ *Ib.*, October 28.

Professor Jebb, on the other hand,¹ quotes Sir William Thomson, P. R. S. (Lord Kelvin), as "very heartily" agreeing with the arguments against the "syndicate," and adding as his reason: "I think, for the sake of mathematicians and science students, Cambridge and Oxford should keep Greek, of which even a very moderate extent is of very great value."

A later statement from the executive committee for the opposing of the "grace" is also of interest as the appointed day approaches: "The strength of our position at this stage is, that, on the occasion of the last inquiry, which was conducted on an unusually complete scale, there was no evidence that able persons were excluded from the University by the requirement of two classical languages; and that no evidence has now been offered to show that since that time such a class has come into existence." The fact is also mentioned that a list of persons opposing the "grace" contains the names of ten Senior Wranglers and eight Senior Classics.

Mr. J. K. Stephen calls attention to the fact,² that only two years ago "every question relevant to the present issue was discussed and decided in connection with the retention of Greek in the Poll degree." He thinks the character of the names proposed for the "syndicate" rightly suspicious to the conservatives; "they would be the first, if the grace were passed, to point to the vote as practically conclusive of the main question at issue."

Among all the pamphlets, of all the fugitive literature to which the controversy gave birth, nothing has been spoken of so highly as a brochure by the same Mr. J. K. Stephen, formerly a fellow of King's,³ on the "Living Languages." Mr. E. S. Shuckburgh,⁴ for instance, praises Mr. Stephen in the highest terms, as having put "in every variety of light the value of Greek as a literature, as a means of mental training, as holding the key to other literatures, ancient and modern, as being still in the highest sense a living influence." "The indifference of some," says Mr. Stephen, "and the hostility of others, have not availed, thanks principally

¹ *Mail*, October 28.

² *Ib.*, October 28.

³ Mr. Stephen has since died, *æt.* 32, at the beginning of a career of brightest promise; cp. the *Cambridge Review's* *Quis desiderio*, February 11, 1892. His general "disregard of intellectual authorities and conventionalities" added no little weight to his conservative opinion on this question. His brilliant pamphlet deserves to be widely read, both among the friends and foes of Greek.

⁴ *Cambridge Review*, October 22; cp. also *Saturday Review*, October 24.

to our Universities, to extirpate the study of the 'dead languages.' Why should they avail now? Let Cambridge remember that in educational matters her duty is to lead, and not to follow; and that the object of securing popularity and numbers is far less important than that of protecting the cause of learning, research, and education. We need not despair of weathering whatever storm may be in preparation for those who are supposed to be behind the age; and Greek and Latin may be left by the present generation, not the 'dead languages' which their opponents would make them, but, as they have so long been, 'living languages,' efficient educational instruments, and the subject-matter of the most honourable and fruitful studies of the English intellect."

Another pamphlet is that of Professor Mayor, irreverently compared by the "Oxford Magazine" (October 28) to a note on Juvenal, "minus the text to elucidate the commentator's meaning." The professor thinks — this in one of his lucid intervals, according to the same shameless chronicon — "that the Cambridge of the fifteenth century, with the Vulgate and Breviary, Aquinas and the Latin Fathers, for its staple diet, needed far less the corrective of Greek and Roman wisdom than do the sciences which deal with matter or with abstract reasoning. There is real danger that we may become a middle-class school of engineering and mechanics and physical science." And then — apparently to crush the argument that the practically useful studies are not yet proved to be the best discipline — the vegetarian of St. John's exclaims, "Were I still a sepulchre for fowl, I should choose one bird in the hand before two in the bush."

A fly-sheet of Mr. Bateson,¹ himself a distinguished teacher of science, pleads "for the retention of Greek in the interests of science:" "If compulsory Greek is abolished, it will be done by men of two classes. The one has culture by instinct; to them it is inconceivable that any should be really without it, or that to any it can be taught. The other class by instinct and training is barbarous, and would fain destroy what it cannot understand."

Two fundamental flaws in the proposers' arguments were pointed out by Dr. Stanford:² (1) "That we shall best perform our duty of leading the education of the country by obeying the caprices of intending students, who *ex hypothesi* are yet uneducated;" (2) "That opposition to the appointment of a syndicate means an attempt to resist enquiry, whereas no syndicate, however able,

¹ *Cambridge Review*, October 29.

² *Ib.*, October 29.

could produce new arguments on the principle of a change so much debated, and therefore those who are opposed to the scheme in general may with perfect fairness resist any proposal to elaborate details."

Quotations from radical pamphlets and broadsides the present reviewer has been unable to find, but has been obliged to content himself with newspaper correspondence. We may hear in conclusion one of the headmasters, Mr. E. Lyttelton (Haileybury),—this published on the very day of the vote:¹ "The real strength of the demand for change lies in the fact that very many boys now burdened with two languages fail to get the training which could be secured by a more thorough knowledge of one."

On Thursday, October 29, the question was decided by the Senate, at a special Congregation, which is said to have been the largest ever held. And as the gathering was unprecedented, so the majority was unexpectedly large. "Schemes actually proposed by such syndicates had been rejected, within the last few years, by majorities of thirty or forty."² On this occasion, out of a total of 710,³ 185 voted for the "grace," and 525 against. Of the 35 mathematical professors and lecturers more voted for Greek (strictly speaking, against a new investigation) than against it (13 to 12). Among the classical men who voted for the "grace," and hence to be counted with the opposition, were Drs. Jackson, Reid, and Verrall, Messrs. Thompson, Hicks, St. John Parry, Peskett, and Nixon.

Among the natural science men who voted against the "syndicate" were Professor Newton, Messrs. Acton, Bateson, Harmer, Melsome, Ruhemann, and Seward. Drs. Taylor and Hort declared themselves in favor of Greek, as also Professors Browne and Robertson Smith, Sir T. Wade, Dr. Cunningham, and Mr. Mullinger; while on the opposite side we find Professors Sidgwick, Seeley, Macalister, Cayley, Gwatkin, Maitland, Dr. Ward, and Mr. Frazer.

It will not have escaped observation that the minority vote of 185 contains all of those who, while not declaring themselves against Greek, were yet in favor of a new inquiry, reserving their

¹ *Cambridge Review*, October 29.

² *Saturday Review*, October 31.

³ The roll of the Senate includes all Doctors, of whatever Faculty, all Masters of Arts, Law, and Surgery, and Bachelors of Divinity; provided they keep their names upon the University Register. The total number in 1891 was 6,774.

opinion on the merits of the case until the results of that inquiry should be made known. Just how large a proportion were mere "inquirers," it is impossible to determine. At first sight one is tempted to attribute the overwhelming majority to the non-resident members, who, swarming up to Cambridge in such numbers, might have forced their opinions upon the helpless resident minority. But, as a matter of fact, the Electoral Roll, or list of the resident members of the Senate,¹ includes about 500 names, and in the unusual excitement it is incredible that less than 400 of them voted, while the whole number of the votes cast was but 710. Even supposing the minority to have been composed exclusively of residents, which was far from being the case, there would still be a majority of the resident members against the measure.² The university alone is responsible, — not the out-of-town members. There can be no doubt but that a large number of those whose votes made investigation impossible declared themselves as they did, simply to prevent the real question, which could not have been raised for many months, from being prejudiced by the preliminary and unimportant question. They had every reason to feel that if the present "grace" were passed, it would be regarded as tantamount to a victory for the opposition, and would in the long interval so strengthen their hands as to leave the final issue more than doubtful.

It is no part of the purpose of this paper to epitomize the various review articles which have appeared on this subject before and after the decision. However, a few extracts from some of them may not be a wholly unwelcome addition to a historical sketch of the controversy.

An article by Dr. Welldon, in the "Contemporary Review," so long ago as May, 1890, is of interest as showing what ideas are abroad among the headmasters; for the vote taken at their Oxford conference justifies the inference that the article in question — which discusses the whole subject of studies, principal and subordinate, assigning Latin and French to the former class, and Greek and German to the latter — is fairly representative of a large minority of their number. The late Professor E. A. Freeman, in "Macmillan" (March, 1891), defends Greek as a "more pure

¹ The Electoral Roll embraces, besides all officers of the University, all members of the Senate who have resided fourteen weeks, in the preceding year, within one and one half miles of Great St. Mary's.

² *Saturday Review*, October 31, "The Latest Marathon," estimates the majority of the residents as at least two to one.

and perfect instrument of mental training than the kindred tongue whose relation to the daily affairs of ordinary life is so much closer ;” but together they “have a position which nothing else can share, in the training of the mind, . . . in anything to be called a liberal education, an education whose object is the training of the mind and not the filling of the pocket.” It is only the scientific study of language that the universities can recognize.

Another article of Dr. Welldon's, in the “Contemporary Review” for October, 1891, claims for the headmasters the credit of initiating the movement. He does not regret that the peculiar constitution of the universities makes a change impossible until the reform has won its way “beyond the circle of specialists to the approval of the popular judgment.” The headmasters’ predilections are all in favor of compulsory Greek, since modern sides “have been created not by the grace of headmasters, but in spite of them.” With the great increase in the number of subjects, “the classical languages, if they reign at the present time, must reign like all monarchs, not by any supposed divine right, but by the right of reasonable utility.” The arguments for the removal of a Greek requirement are : —

1. “The number of boys in the public schools who do not learn Greek has become so large¹ that it is undesirable to exclude them all from academical life, or to admit them to it only upon condition of their taking up a study which has not formed, and would not naturally form, a part of their education.” In which of the Aristotelian senses the translator of Aristotle here uses “naturally,” we may not venture to state.

2. “The study of Greek, if it be seriously prosecuted, occupies so great a part of a boy's school time as to deny him the opportunity of studying other subjects which it may be important and even essential for him to know.”

3. “The possibility of giving an education which deserves to be regarded as liberal without the knowledge of Greek has now for some time been proved by experience.”

4. “The Universities will render the best service to the nation by opening their doors as widely as possible to all students who satisfy the requirement of a liberal education.”

Speaking of “modern side” boys, Dr. Welldon makes the following frank admission: “If it is necessary to mention one particular in which they sometimes fall below their classical rivals, it

¹ At the headmasters’ conference it was stated that out of a total of 20,400 boys in the “public schools,” 10,400 were not learning Greek.

may be said to be the habit of accuracy, of perseverance, and of sustained or concentrated attention to a subject which is not at once interesting and attractive, but demands a large amount of painstaking effort, if it is to be effectively pursued."

This confession is taken up in the "Contemporary Review" (November, 1891), by Professor Freeman, who thinks one could hardly ask for further admissions. To remove "compulsory" Greek is only to put "compulsory" something else in its place. French and German are not easier than Latin and Greek unless taught in a different way; but the universities must require the scholarly way, and in the scientific study of languages the older should have for good reasons the precedence.

Last of all we notice an article by Mr. J. B. Bury, in the "Fortnightly," December, 1891, which is especially directed against those who have tried to point out that Greek is useful in this way and that. Latin may have some claims to usefulness, but "Greek is not, in any serious measure, subject to vexations of this kind; and may laugh securely at those who try, with blundering good-nature, to invent a sphere of usefulness for it." The University's general course of study can make no account of specialists. "It is not the scope of the 'arts' to help any one to put money into his purse, or heal the sick, or fathom the secrets of the 'law's delay,' or believe in any form of religion. . . . The true function of a University is the teaching of useless learning." Greek is the type of a University study because not subsidiary to anything, and above mere utility; hence "the very last subject that should be thrown overboard, for it represents, in the purest form, the ideal of University education. . . . The useless knowledge itself may be lost, but the acquisition of it is a permanent mental fact which can never be undone. . . . A University is useful because what it teaches is useless."

Frank G. Moore.

YALE COLLEGE, NEW HAVEN, CONN.

EDITORIAL.

THE DIVINITY OF CHRIST.

II. THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

DID the primitive church believe Jesus Christ to be a divine being? Inquiry as to his divinity naturally begins with this question. The first Christians were personally associated with Jesus; some of them lived in intimacy with Him. Their impressions of Him, therefore, are a historical source of knowledge of Him second only to his assertions about himself. Then their belief about Christ, obviously a very important article of their religious faith, is a means of finding out whether the church doctrine that Christ is divine is a part of Christianity and is entitled to the respectful consideration which Christianity has earned by its influence on men. If at the very beginning of its life the church held Jesus Christ to be divine, and considered the doctrine of his divineness to be a part of the gift of truth it had received from God, and accredited by its religious experience, the doctrine is presumptively true because it belongs to a life consciously rooted in God.

If it were proved that the primitive church did not hold that Christ was divine, that this belief came into the mind of Christendom, say, in the third century, then it might be urged that the doctrine did not belong to the essence of Christianity, inasmuch as Christianity had existed in its full strength without having it. At any rate, whatever other claims it might bring, it could not present this one, of having always belonged to the faith which overcame the world, of having belonged to that faith in its beginning, when it was distinctly conscious of the elements constituting its life. But if the contrary be proved, those who would set aside the doctrine must face the question, How could a gross delusion bear fruit in such livery as that of the apostolic church?

Did the primitive church believe Jesus Christ to be a divine being? We seek an answer to the question in the writings of the Apostles. They were the voice of the church. Its faith and life found clearest and fullest expression through them. Their letters, written to instruct and guide it, put the truths in which and by which it lived into simple form, adapted to immediate spiritual need. The artlessness and the practical nature of these writings make them more adequate evidence of the contents of the religious consciousness of their writers and readers than elaborate treatises would be.

We begin with the letters of the Apostle Paul, because they were earliest in time and of fullest content. Does any one object to counting this Apostle among the witnesses to the belief of primitive Christianity on the ground that he was not one of the disciples of Jesus, and was not converted until several years after the church was established? Is it sug-

gested that as he received his first ideas of Christianity in a special way, they may have been peculiar ideas? Is it said in confirmation of this suggestion that we find some evidence in the oldest of church histories that Paul did not agree with the estimate of the original Apostles as to what constitutes Christianity? The answer is, Paul worked in fellowship with the original Apostles; he acknowledged their tradition of Jesus to be true, and authoritative, and lent his own authority to it; he incorporated much of that tradition into his teaching; he spoke of the original Apostles with honor, not only as witnesses of Christ's resurrection, but as Christian laborers; he did not in any of his letters criticise their teaching in any point, and the Acts does not show that he even differed from them about the requirements proper to be imposed on Gentile converts. It is altogether unlikely, therefore, that he held a different view of the common Master; that he gave Jesus an honor which those who had lived with Him, and treasured up his words, and seen Him, as they believed, after He rose from the dead, could not concede. Moreover, the writings of the earlier Apostles show, as we shall presently see, that their thought of Jesus agreed with that of the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Paul believed that a true religious faith, one that brought man into right relations to God, and produced good character, had Jesus Christ as its central object. The gospel which he carried to men, and commended to them with agony of earnestness, was the gospel of Christ, that is, about Christ. "Him we preach," he said, describing his life-work. That work was a personal one. Paul carried his gospel to every man he could reach, because he believed that every man's welfare depended absolutely on his having and using it. Only by believing on Jesus Christ could any man come into right relation to God and possess true manhood.

All this is commonplace to those who are familiar with the Pauline letters. It is equally obvious to them that the supreme significance which Paul believed Jesus Christ to possess belonged to Him in his present invisible and heavenly life. It was not because Christ in his earthly life revealed certain sublime truths, but because in his risen life, unseen by men, yet in living intercourse with them, He was all-important, that believing on Him was the one way to true well-being.

Faith in Him united to Him. To Paul, the believer is *ipso facto* Christ's servant. He lives unto Christ. He also lives *with* his Master. He is, as it were, encompassed by this invisible Person, to whom he is wedded by a union closer than that which joins husband and wife; he is "in Christ."

The appreciation of Jesus Christ which to Paul is all-essential means more than appreciating the quality of his earthly life; it means knowing the significance of his being, the nature He bears, the position He holds in the universe. This is evident from the reason alleged for the importance of appreciating the event in his career in which his character

most plainly appears, — the crucifixion. "Christ crucified is the power of God and wisdom of God." The death of Jesus reveals God as does no other event in history, because it is a power to reconcile man to Him. He whose death has this value is separate from all others. "Herein God commendeth his love toward us, in that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us." The significance of the death rests upon the value of the life offered in sacrifice. This, too, lies on the surface of the letters of Paul.

Whom did the Apostle believe this Person whom he preached to be? — this Person who after death had immediate relations with men; this Person, into living union with whom all men might enter, to have union with whom was to be united to God and to have holy character. Paul believed that Christ's existence did not begin with his earthly life. He told the Philippians (Phil. ii. 5-8) that Christ's earthly life expressed his condescending love, inasmuch as He, when existing in the divine form, emptied himself, taking upon Him the form of a slave, and being found in fashion as a man. The Philippian letter was written two or three years later than Paul's more elaborate, doctrinal epistles; but this fact gives no reason for suspecting that his belief in the preëxistence of Jesus grew up in his mind after the latter were written. For he said to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xv. 47): "The second man is out of heaven." It seems only just to give these words the interpretation suggested by the Philippian passage, and to make them teach that Christ lived in heaven before He lived on earth. This is, indeed, their obvious meaning, and the meaning which the Apostle's thought requires. "The new mankind has as its prototype, not the man of earthly but the man of heavenly origin." If Jesus had a heavenly origin, He came here from heaven; that is, left a heavenly for an earthly life. Paul says what is equivalent to this in telling the Corinthians (2 Cor. viii. 9): "For ye know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that, although he was rich, yet on your account he became poor, that ye through his poverty might become rich." Jesus never had earthly riches. The words are naturally interpreted only when understood as referring to an act of self-renouncing love preceding and coextensive with his earthly life. Paul wrote to the Galatians (Gal iv. 4): "When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son, born of a woman, born under the law, that he might redeem those under the law," etc. We believe that preëxistence is here ascribed to Christ. The sending forth spoken of seems to be sending into the world from heaven. This is suggested by the words "born of a woman." This affirmation made about any other man would be meaningless. The language of Romans viii. 3, "God in sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh," also seems to affirm by implication the preëxistence of Christ.

What kind of a being did Paul believe the preëxistent Christ to be?

Did he think Him to be an angel? We find no evidence of such a belief in the Apostle's letters. True, he believed in the existence of angels; but they seem to have had an inconspicuous place in his theology. He does not often allude to them. They never are mentioned when he is showing how men's great religious needs may be met. There is nothing in Paul's letters suggesting that he thought that any angel could render men such service as he attributes to Jesus Christ. Indeed, his theology gives reason for believing that he could not have attributed an angelic nature to Christ. For he says that Jesus was the second man; the founder of a new mankind; and believes his significance for man to be due to the fact that He is the one man in whom our race finds its natural head and representative. But would an angelic nature, one of another created order, have fitted Him to be the representative man, the most human of all men, the one who perfectly expresses God's idea of man?

The presumption drawn from Paul's theology is confirmed by the language which he uses of the preëxistent Christ. He seems to imply that He was a being other than angelic, one not included among created beings, a divine being. Paul taught this in telling the Philippians, in the passage which we have already quoted, that Jesus Christ was in the form of God before he wore the form of a slave, being found in fashion as a man; that he did not deem equality with God a prize to be clutched at, but emptied himself to enter upon the earthly condition. The slave form was the humanity in its outward seeming. He had the seeming because he had the thing. Men saw in him not the "counterfeit presentment" of manhood, but manhood itself. The form of God was God appearing. He was not an angel who had put on the semblance of God. He was divine in his being, and so had the form belonging to God. The equality to God to which he might have aspired was not a prize to be clutched at, but was renounced in condescending self-sacrificing love. Because of this act of love "God highly exalted him; and gave him the name above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow of those in heaven and in earth, and under the earth, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father."

The exalted Christ receives the homage of the created universe. Then He does not belong to the creation; creatures do not worship creatures. Is it said that Jesus receives exaltation to supremacy as a gift from God the Father? He does; and the gift is not arbitrarily bestowed, but expresses the fitness of Jesus to be so honored; a fitness in virtue of his being, his character, and his work. One who has given up the divine form of existence for the human form, and in that human form has surrendered himself to a violent death, and has through this act of love founded a spiritual kingdom among the men whose nature and lot he has assumed, should be adored by men and angels. Both see the divine love in Him, and should worship it. If it is objected that Paul's declaration, that the

confession of Christ's supreme Lordship is "to the glory of God the Father," shows that he did not believe Jesus to be divine, it is enough to answer that this assumes that he could not have believed personal distinctions to have existed in the divine nature, an assumption proved by this very passage to be unwarranted. If he ascribes to Christ the possession of a divine being and the reception of divine honors, and also speaks of a divine Father to whom these honors ultimately flow, we must let these words present to us his thought of the divine nature. We may not explain away a part of his language because it does not accord with the notion of deity which we assume him to have.

Paul told the Corinthian Church that Christian monotheism included, along with the recognition of God as the source and goal of the universe and of the Christian life, the recognition of Jesus Christ as the mediator through whom the universe came into being, and through whom the Christian life began (1 Cor. viii. 5, 6). "An idol is nothing, and there is no God but one. For although there are many alleged gods whether in heaven, or in earth, just as there are [according to heathen systems of worship] gods many and lords many, yet to us there is but one God the Father, out of whom are all things, and for whom we are, and one Lord Jesus Christ through whom are all things, and through whom are we." As against the imaginary many gods of polytheism, the Christian has one God the Father, one Lord Jesus Christ. Is it said that a lower place is assigned to Jesus Christ than to the Father? His relation to the Father is explained in the following words: "Through whom are all things; and we through him." By his agency the universe comes into being. The universe has its ultimate source in the will and mind of God the Father; its mediate source in the activity of Jesus. Creative activity is divine activity. He who exercises it is not a part of the creation. In saying, therefore, as he virtually does, that Christian monotheism includes recognition of Jesus Christ through whom God creates the universe, Paul ascribes divineness to Him. We find here, as in the Philippian passage, evidence that he thought of the one divine nature as having in itself personal distinctions, by virtue of which Jesus Christ, as well as the Father, could be called divine.

In the Colossian letter (Col. ii. 15, 16), Paul separates Christ from the creation, calling Him "first-born as regards every creature," and saying that all things were created through Him and for Him, and that all things stand together in Him, as though He not only put forth the activity bringing the universe into being, but was the principle, as it were, uniting it and preserving it. This we believe he could not have said of a creature.

In these assertions about the preëxistent Christ, Paul seems to have ascribed to Him a divine nature. A confirmation of our interpretation may be found in his view of the relation which the incarnate Christ sustains towards the human race. He is, to Paul, as we have already said, its head, the member of it whose life is of supreme significance to every

person in it. This He is not only ideally, by virtue of having carried humanity to perfection in his own life, but actually, by virtue of power to draw its members into union with himself and participation of his perfection. "The second man is a life-giving Spirit." He gives life to his brother men. So He draws them to Him one by one, transforming them as they become united to Him, until at last all the race (substantially all, all but the refuse) share his life, his character, and his divine sonship. And how does this man draw other men to himself? What makes Him "life-giving Spirit"? Why are all the possibilities for mankind in Him? Because He has the Spirit of God, because the Spirit of God is *his* Spirit, so that that Spirit may be thought of as Christ in activity. What does this mean but that the humanity of Christ is divine; that the Son of God has become this man, and is in Him the fountain of a new life for mankind? From Jesus Christ, God's spirit goes out into mankind, because Jesus Christ has God's spirit as the outgoing of his divine life. So the Apostle Paul can speak of the Spirit of God as also the Spirit of Christ; and can say that the indwelling of this Spirit in a man is equivalent to the indwelling of Christ in him.

Assuming that Paul saw in Christ a human life to which the divine Son had so given himself as to make it divine, we can understand the powers he ascribes to the exalted Redeemer, and see why he recognizes in Him the first fruits of a redeemed humanity. Without this assumption, his doctrine of a divine life-giving man is an enigma to us. And we do not believe that he would have called the Spirit of God the "Spirit of Christ" unless he had believed Christ to be divine.

It may be objected that if Paul had held the view of Christ's person which we ascribe to him, he could not have said that after all things shall have been subdued to the Son, He will be subjected to God, in order that God may be all in all (1 Cor. 15-28). If this passage taught that Christ would at some time take the place of a creature, we should find in it an affirmation contradictory to the passages we have cited as teaching that He is not a created being. We do not find such teaching in it. "The reign" ascribed to the Son in the passage is the activity growing out of the presence of sin in the world. The divine-human Redeemer is at the head of a redemptive economy. All divine forces available for the recovery of men from sin go from Him. In Him, men coming out of sin touch God. For them to know God is to know Him revealed in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. Their conceptions of God are chiefly thoughts of a redeeming Saviour. Their service of God is essentially service of the redeeming Christ. When all the enemies shall have been put down, it will be otherwise. That which God is in himself will come more clearly into view. Men will not simply possess his redeeming love in Christ, they will possess the exhaustless wealth of his Being. The divine humanity will abide, but will be seen as the manifestation of the glory of God. This is what we believe Paul to have

meant by the ultimate subjection of the Son, in order that God may be all in all. He cannot have meant that God would remove from his throne a creature whom He had temporarily placed there.

But it may still be objected Paul does not apply the term "God" (*θεός*) to Christ. He does not, because he does not think that God and Christ are exact equivalents. He did not hold, as the Christian church has never held, that the Deity is nothing more nor less than Jesus Christ. But this does not imply his not holding that Jesus Christ was divine, was in the being of God. If the revelation he received from Christ did, indeed, lead Paul to ascribe divine attributes to his Master, and so modify his conception of the divine Being, would not this influence on his theology be naturally expressed by language such as we find him using: "To us there is one God the Father, out of whom are all things, and we to him, and one Lord Jesus Christ by whom are all things and we by him"?

We pass on to the writings of the other Apostles. Here, we need hardly say, Christ has the same prominence as in the Pauline letters. The gospel which they convey is the good tidings about Him. They say that the spiritual relation with Him which faith establishes is the one condition of living in fellowship with God and securing a holy character. At one with Paul here, his fellow Apostles were presumably at one with him in his conception of Christ. Is there evidence that they, too, believed Jesus to be divine? We think that there is. The Apocalypse pictures the Lamb slain as receiving the worship of the created universe (Rev. v. 8-13): "And every creature in heaven, and on earth, and under the earth, and in the sea, and all things in them, heard I saying, To the one sitting upon the throne, and to the Lamb, be blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, for ever and ever." It represents Jesus as saying of himself, in words almost exactly reproducing those which the Hebrew prophet ascribes to Jehovah: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, the beginning and the end" (Rev. xxi. 6). To the seer his being seemed to lie outside of and to include the universe. This is not creaturely being. The same affirmation is made in another place of the Almighty God (Rev. i. 8). If this seems contradicted by the title given to Jesus, — "beginning of the creation of God" (Rev. iii. 14), — it is only just to say that ἀρχὴ may as properly be rendered principle or source (Weizsäcker renders it here *Urgrund*), and that we may only ascribe self-contradictory affirmations to a writer when forced to do so by linguistic necessity. The Gospel of Matthew represents Jesus as saying, after his resurrection, "All power is given to me in heaven and in earth." It also represents Him as associating himself with the Father in the formula of baptism. The First Epistle of Peter speaks of Christ in language which Isaiah uses of Jehovah (1 Pet. iii. 14, 15): "Fear ye not their fear, neither be terrified. But sanctify Christ as Lord in your hearts." Cf. Isa. viii. 12, 13: "Neither fear ye their fear, nor be

afraid. Sanctify the Lord of hosts himself." The similarity of thought suggests that the writer felt that Christ was to his people what Jehovah was to the children of Israel.

We come to the Fourth Gospel. This we believe to have been written by the Apostle John. Many hold it to be a production of the second century. They will probably demur to our using it as a source of knowledge as to the religious belief of primitive Christianity. Yet it is proper to remind them that the boldest criticism finds itself unable to dispense with the supposition that the author used a tradition coming through the Apostle John, and to ask them if one holding this supposition can assume that the views of the author and those of John about Christ were at variance?

The Gospel presents Jesus as the incarnate Word. And what does the writer mean by the "Word"? Evidently a personal principle in the divine Being. The Word was in the beginning with God. All things were made by Him (the personal pronoun is used). Life was in Him, and the life was the light of men. John Baptist came to testify to the light which the life in the Word was. This light, the true light, was coming into the world. The Word was made flesh and tabernacled among us, full of grace and truth, and we saw his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father. A personal and a divine life are attributed to this Word which became incarnate. If Paul ascribed personality to the Lord Jesus Christ in his preëxistent state, when He said that all things were through Him, John ascribed personality to the preëxistent Word, in saying that all things came into being through Him. Dr. Wendt, of Heidelberg, has lately advanced a different interpretation, namely, that the "Word" is revelation personified. John would declare, he says, that the revelation embodied in nature, and more fully expressed in pre-Christian religious life, took on full expression in Jesus Christ. We do not find an adequate explanation of the writer's language in this interpretation. He speaks in plain, didactic phrase, just such as is employed in the rest of the Gospel. One naturally believes that he is writing prose, not poetry. His repetitions suggest that he is making statements of transcendent truth, which challenge belief. The progress of his thought belongs to theology, not poetry; and the several statements imply that the "Word" is a personal principle in God, not a personified divine activity. "This one was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him, and apart from him was not anything made that was made. In him was life, and the life was the light of men." "And the Word became flesh and tabernacled among us, full of grace and truth, and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father."

Could all this be said by such a writer as the author of the Fourth Gospel of a personified work or attribute of God? How, for example, could it be said that in this work or attribute was life, and the life

was the light of men? The prologue then teaches that Jesus Christ was the personal Word incarnate. In the narrative we find Him expressing the belief that He had a divine life before his earthly life began. "Before Abraham was, I am," He said to the Jews, when they asked Him whether He, a man not yet forty, had seen Abraham. "Glorify thou me, O Father," He said in his high-priestly prayer, "with the glory which I had with thee before the world was." The Christ of the Fourth Gospel was evidently as truly divine as human, true God as well as true man.

The apostolic writings, then, show that the doctrine of the divinity of Christ was imbedded in the religious consciousness of the primitive church. The question presents itself, Was the apostolic belief in this doctrine rooted in the recollection of the historical Christ? Do his words preserved in the Gospels show He was consciously divine? We will try to answer this question in the next article.

THE ROMAN CATHOLIC POLICY CONCERNING POPULAR EDUCATION.

THE newspapers have published and discussed the Pope's indorsement of Archbishop Ireland in respect to the public schools of Faribault and Stillwater, Minnesota. Some of the parochial schools of those towns were transferred last fall, at a nominal rent, to the Board of Education, and were brought under the public school system. The text-books of the common schools were adopted, and the teachers were required to pass the same examinations as for the public schools. A brief portion of Scripture is read, and the Lord's Prayer is repeated at the opening of the daily sessions. All religious emblems were removed from the rooms, but Catholic teachers of the Dominican order are allowed to wear the robes of the order. After school hours, the Catholics have the use of the buildings for the religious instruction of those children who may remain for that purpose.

This arrangement, which was brought about by Archbishop Ireland, of St. Paul, Minnesota, was severely criticised by some Protestants, who believed it was a scheme to support parochial schools from public funds, and was also opposed by many Catholics, who believed that it would do very little for the religious training of children, and would subject them to all the dangers of godless schools, and also that it was in direct contravention of the decrees of the Council of Baltimore, directing the establishment of parochial schools, since this was a surrender of such schools already existing. The opposition of Catholics became so strenuous that Archbishop Ireland submitted the arrangement to the Pope, and visited Rome in order to set forth the reasons of his action. The result is, that the Pope "tolerates" the arrangement, which means that in practice he approves it. In the communication of the Pope's decision, the following language is used: —

"I hope your Grace will be gratified by this decision of the Holy See ; because, though unusual provisions made by the different bishops in their respective dioceses, according to the requirement of circumstances, cannot be approved directly by the Holy See when they imply a departure, to a certain extent, from a general law, nevertheless, when the Holy See declares that such provisions may be tolerated, it thereby puts an end to all indiscreet attacks upon them."

The only concession which has been made by the local Board of Education is the use of the buildings for religious purposes after school hours. It may be that no other towns will make such concessions, but it would not be strange if elsewhere parochial schoolhouses are converted to similar uses. And even if the use of public school buildings for religious instruction at certain hours is permitted, Catholics who may avail themselves of the permission know that the Pope will not interfere, and Protestants who are sagacious will see in such arrangement the solution of a vexed problem. It is to be remembered that Archbishop Ireland is a liberal Catholic, strongly in favor of Americanizing our foreign population, and, as a means to it, of employing English as the medium of instruction in all schools of Irish, German, French, Polish, and other foreign children.

This arrangement, which has received the sanction of the Pope, is very important in what it signifies. It is one sign of the policy adopted by the Catholic Church in America. Even if the plan should not be followed elsewhere, nor prove permanent in Faribault and Stillwater, the experiment and its sanction furnish as significant an indication of the Roman Catholic policy in America as could be desired.

It is becoming evident, although this is not the most important consideration, that it is extremely difficult, if not impossible, to provide for the separate education of Roman Catholic children in parochial schools. The expense alone would be enormous. The cost of buildings and the salaries of teachers would impose a burden quite beyond the means of Catholics, even if they were willing to give as much as they can. It must already be a question whether the parochial schools now in operation do not harm more than they help the church. Only part of the children in any city can be received, and so a contrast is constantly made between the public and the parochial schools, to the disadvantage of the latter, which are distinctly inferior. But few parents can be made to see the necessity of supporting the church schools, when the public schools, which are superior, are free to all. And it is never forgotten that taxes are paid year after year for the schools from which the priests expect children to be withdrawn. It is none too easy, under the voluntary system, to support churches, to build cathedrals, and to maintain priests, bishops, sisterhoods, and the other agencies of religion ; and the expense of a complete system of schools, which would be as much more, cannot possibly be provided from the narrow means of the Catholic population. We have no doubt that in many places, instead of building more school-

houses, the Catholics would be glad to get rid of the expense of maintaining those they already have, as has been done in Minnesota. We have pointed out more than once that anti-Catholic agitators might afford themselves some comfort from the pecuniary limitations of those they seem to dread. Our opinion is reinforced by the surrender of these parochial schools in the West to the Board of Education.

But of greater consequence is the indication of a policy. This action shows that it is the policy of the Romish Church to Americanize the Catholic people of the United States, so far as this may be done without sacrificing the influence of the church. The Pope favors Archbishop Ireland, Cardinal Gibbons, and other prelates who advocate instruction in English in all schools. The party which favors education of the different nationalities in their own languages would like to keep the Poles, the Germans, the French, by themselves, would like to keep them foreigners, so that the church may control them. The wiser Catholics are beginning to see that the church will have very little influence in the country under such a policy; that it will continue a church of foreigners, and will be looked on with contempt. They see that in this country more is to be gained by influence than by control. They see, moreover, that it is useless to resist education, useless to hold the people away from the democratic spirit which prevails, and wiser to coöperate, to encourage the best education, to let their people be Americans. They see great advantages in the mingling of children in the public schools, and some dangers in separating, as in parochial schools, the children of Catholics from the children of Protestants. There is a long struggle ahead within the Catholic Church. The conservative party, which would keep the people separate by schools apart and by the use of foreign languages, is a very strong party. But the most influential Catholics are liberals, and in favor of making their people American citizens. They see that the task of the church in America is to *hold* its people, and that to do this it is necessary to avoid the impression that the church is hostile to American institutions and methods. The present Pope and his advisers at Rome are sagacious enough to favor the liberal policy. They will thereby do more to promote the spiritual ascendancy of the Catholic Church than they could accomplish by adopting the opposite method. Those who believe that the Romish Church is the worst menace this country has might well be perplexed to know on what side to array themselves, for or against parochial schools, for or against the Americanizing of the foreign Catholics in this country. They think that the Catholic Church is dangerous, because it is made up largely of foreigners, and is controlled by foreigners. But if, by Americanizing its adherents, it will gain in influence, the alarmists are in a dilemma indeed. For our own part, we welcome any measures which make better citizens of the foreigners who are among us, and if at the same time they become better Catholics, we shall not be greatly disturbed.

The Faribault plan is in exact accordance with a suggestion made in one of our editorial articles a year and a half ago, which was, that a portion of time should be surrendered out of the school hours for religious instruction. We then said: —

"We hope the good time is coming when the public schools will have single sessions of three or four hours in the morning, and the rest of the time will be at the disposal of families and churches to train children in the things which are practical, useful, and religious. If so much time were set free, the Catholics could gather the children in their schools, as they do now, to inculcate loyalty to their church, and would have no reason to complain of taxation for the support of secular schools."

In respect to public schools, it is becoming clearer with every year that only one course can be pursued. That course is to tax the whole community for their support, making no exception whatever. Then private schools of any grade may be permitted with the largest freedom. If, at the same time, there is improvement in the methods of instruction, as along the lines recently recommended in New England and which we have advocated in former articles, the public schools will be attended by children of all churches and all classes, and will continue in greater measure than at present to foster, indirectly, the democratic spirit.

SOCIAL LEGISLATION; THE NEW DANISH POOR-LAW. — BELGIAN COUNCILS OF ARBITRATION.

THE London "Guardian" has published somewhat recently two communicated editorials which contain interesting information respecting legislation in Denmark for the relief of the deserving and aged poor, and in Belgium for the adjustment of labor disputes. The first article gives an account of a law which went into operation at Copenhagen on the beginning of this year, and is designed to distinguish, in the administration of governmental aid, between those who in advanced years are in need through their own fault, and those who are so through misfortune. Hitherto all such beneficiaries have been put into one class, that of paupers. The present experiment follows a different method, and creates a clear distinction, marked by a new designation. There will be paupers as before, but there will also be among those receiving public charity a separated type, who will "occupy the position of state pensioners, precisely the same as if they were worn-out soldiers." Such persons are treated as worthy constituents of the community, as having a claim upon it for what they receive; not as objects of charity, but as members of the civic family, possessing rights in its organization and well-being. They vote as do others: They are restrained of no social or political privilege otherwise open to them, provided no increased dependence upon state relief is thereby incurred. If the benefits conferred are misappropriated or perverted, the law protects itself from such abuse of its intent,

but otherwise the entire relation is one which fosters a sense of personal dignity and self-respect, and avoids the degrading associations connected with the term "pauper," and involved more or less extensively in the structure and administration of ordinary Poor-Laws.

The Danish law guards itself carefully from abuse. The applicant must be at least sixty years of age, and a reputable citizen. "His poverty shall not be the consequence of any actions by which he, for the benefit of his children or others, has deprived himself of the means of subsistence, or be caused by a disorderly and extravagant mode of life, or in any other way be brought about by his own fault." "For the ten years preceding the date of his application for 'old-age relief,' he must have had a fixed residence in the country, and during that period not have been in receipt of relief from the Poor-Law Administration, or been found guilty of vagrancy and begging." Standing as a pensioner is forfeited by crime or any act which degrades from the class for whom the new method of relief is instituted. Marriage, if it entails increased pecuniary necessities, transfers from the rank of a pensioner to that of a pauper. If a man is found to squander what he receives, his support is withdrawn. The aid given is intended to be sufficient to supply all necessary wants. The kind and method of the relief are left very much to the discretion of the authorities who administer it. They may admit to asylums, but cannot send a pensioner to the workhouse.

The funds necessary to the operation of this scheme are not raised by the ordinary taxation for care of the poor. If we understand aright, it is left to each town, or municipal corporation, to determine what it will do. Each local community is guaranteed by the state a sum equal to that which it raises itself for the relief of its aged and meritorious residents whose circumstances require aid. The Parliamentary appropriation is restricted to 2,000,000 kronor, about \$535,000. The writer to whom we are indebted for our information thinks that unless this appropriation is increased, the towns will be obliged to be very economical in their distributions, or else raise, themselves, more than a moiety of what is expended. He adds:—

"The new Danish Poor-Law is no ideal measure, but it is certainly a step in the right direction. By removing the stigma of pauper from the respectable poor whose destitution is the result of no fault of their own, it does something at least to lessen the sufferings of those for whom life is at best but one long, terrible struggle. Ugly little stories get afloat in England, from time to time, of old men and women choosing to die of hunger in the streets—one of them not long ago on the steps of the Mansion House, whilst a civic banquet was in progress—rather than submit to the treatment we mete out to our paupers. Denmark shows us how we can at least put a stop to scandals such as these."

The relief afforded under our laws does not carry with it, we suppose, all the evils of the English workhouse system; yet there is room for improvement, the beginning of which must be found in a higher and more practical appreciation of human worth and of social obligation.

The application, in Belgium, to labor strifes of the principle of arbitration has been greatly promoted by the establishment of Boards of Conciliation. Of the more important of these councils, the following account is given :—

“The Councils of Prud’hommes are at once the most popular and the most influential of the Belgian Boards of Conciliation. They were established as far back as 1806,—a time when Belgium took its laws from Paris. Since then, however, they have undergone many changes, notably in 1859 and 1889. At the latter date, in consequence of the recommendation of a Royal Commission held to consider their working, they were entirely reorganized for the purpose of bringing them into closer touch with the wage-earning classes. The law of 1889 affirms that the Councils of Prud’hommes are instituted for the express purpose ‘de vider, par voie de conciliation, ou, à défaut de conciliation, par voie de jugement, les différends qui s’élèvent soit entre les chefs d’industrie et les ouvriers, soit entre les ouvriers eux-mêmes.’ Thus the very *raison d’être* of their existence is to reconcile the opposing interests of capital and labor, and provide an inexpensive, expeditious way of settling any differences which may arise between them. All disputes relating to wages, hours of work, or work itself, between an employer and his own employees, or between two or more employees, in the same factory, must be referred to the Prud’hommes for consideration before they can be brought into a court of law. Rival masters and men working in different factories may also, if they choose, refer their disputes to the Prud’hommes ; but they are not legally bound to do so.

“A Council of Prud’hommes consists of six members at least, one half of whom are elected by the employers of labor in the district in which the council is held, and the other half by their employees. A Prud’homme must have completed his thirtieth year, be a man of good character, have lived in the district for not less than twelve months, and have been engaged, either as a master or a workman, in one of the trades or crafts represented by the council, for four or more years. Innkeepers, spirit-merchants, and bankrupts who have not paid their debts in full are not eligible for election. No one can be compelled to accept the office ; but the person who undertakes it, and then neglects to fulfill the duties it entails, is liable to be imprisoned or fined. A Prud’homme holds office for six years, one half of the council retiring every third year. He receives no salary, but his expenses are paid, and a small daily allowance is made to him during the time he is actually engaged on the work of the council. The qualifications of an elector are the same as those of a Prud’homme. He, however, is allowed to vote from his twenty-fifth year. The president and the vice-president of the council are appointed by the Crown. They are not necessarily Prud’hommes, but one of them must be chosen from the list of names drawn up by the workmen in the council, and the other from a list drawn up by the masters. If the president belong to the capitalist class, the vice-president must be a workman, and vice versa. If the whole of the council, masters and men, are unanimous in their choice of a president, the Crown is obliged to appoint the person chosen. The *greffier*, who is to the Prud’hommes what a town clerk is to English magistrates, is also appointed by the Crown. He represents the legal, as apart from the technical, knowledge of the council, and upon him devolves the duty of putting its decisions into legal form. He is a permanent official, and receives a regular

salary. Each industrial centre must have at least one Council of Prud'hommes. This may be divided into sectional boards, in which case each board represents some special industry. In some districts it has been found more convenient to establish an independent council for each separate industry.

"The *modus agendi* of a council is eminently practical. Two of its members, a master and a workman, are chosen to form what is called a Bureau de Conciliation. They hold office for three months, during which time they must sit one day — in some districts two — a week to hear complaints and examine into any business it is proposed to bring before the council. No case can be heard by the council until it has been reported on by the Bureau. The Bureau has no power of making awards or pronouncing sentences; its function is limited to trying by argument and persuasion to bring about a friendly agreement between disputants. These must either appear in person, or be represented by relatives or friends. Under no circumstances may a lawyer or professional expert conduct a case before a Conciliation Board. The proceedings of the Bureau are secret, as it is regarded essentially as a *tribunal de famille*. The great majority of disputes are settled by this Bureau, and are never brought before the council at all. Out of the 1,145 cases which were referred to the Prud'hommes at Charleroi, only thirty-six ever came before the full council; the rest were arranged either by the *greffier* or the Bureau de Conciliation. It is only when they have failed to arrange terms of agreement that the council intervenes. Even then it does not at once proceed to judgment; but, in the first instance, sits as a court of arbitration, and does not assume its judicial functions until it has exhausted all other means of bringing about an agreement. When sitting judicially, it has the power of examining witnesses on oath, punishing for contempt of court, inflicting fines, and deciding summarily all cases in which the damages claimed are under 200 francs. When they exceed that amount, the person condemned has the right of appeal to a Tribunal de Commerce, or, if he be a miner, to a civil court. It is a most unusual thing, however, for an appeal to be made against the decision of a council. In the year 1885, 3,051 disputes were referred to the Prud'hommes for settlement; 2,753 of them were arranged by arbitration, formal judgment being pronounced in 298 cases. Out of these there were only twelve appeals. The person against whom judgment is pronounced pays the expenses of the case, unless the court decides that he had ample justification for bringing the action. Then the costs, which rarely amount to more than a few francs, are divided amongst the contending parties. The salary of the *greffier* is paid by the government; all other expenses in connection with the council fall upon the communal authorities of the district in which it is held. They are never heavy. During the year 1890 the expenses of the council in Brussels were somewhat under £200.

"The Councils of Industry and Labor have hardly yet had time to make their influence felt as Conciliation Boards. M. Frère-Orban is responsible for the law establishing them. When introducing it into the Chamber of Representatives, he expressly declared that he had framed the measure for the purpose of 'preventing strikes from degenerating into civil war, and for protecting the workman from the dreamers who dazzle him with unrealizable ideas, from the fools who would lead him astray, and most of all from the knaves whose object it is to get their living out of him.' This he proposed doing 'by bringing masters and men together, in the absence of any industrial struggle

and before any contest should break out, to deliberate and pronounce an opinion on all matters affecting their common interests.' The members of these councils are chosen in precisely the same way as the *Prud'hommes*, one half of them being masters, the other half workmen. They are, however, consultative rather than judicial bodies; and, although they may arbitrate, they cannot pronounce judgment. They are more technical than the greater councils, each separate craft having a distinct, autonomous council of its own, in forty-eight districts. This renders them eminently suitable for undertaking the office of arbitrators in disputes which turn on technical points, and of advising the government on labor questions. The fact, however, of the Councils of Industry being unable to meet unless summoned by a royal decree must always interfere materially with their usefulness.

"In addition to the Councils of *Prud'hommes*, and Industry, and Labor, which may be regarded as the official boards of conciliation, there are many others, especially in the mining districts, which are established upon a less formal basis. The same idea pervades them all, namely, that men who work together ought to be able to settle their differences without taking them into a law court. They all in their way do good service by bringing masters and men together, and giving them opportunities of exchanging ideas. . . . Both political parties in Belgium are pledged to further labor legislation. The government has undertaken to develop the principle of the labor councils, and to establish something of the nature of a Labor Parliament. On the part of the Opposition, M. Janson has already framed a bill to increase the number of conciliation boards, and establish labor courts for the special purpose of deciding matters relating to insurance, and to the scale of indemnity to be granted to the victims of accidents."

DR. STORRS'S ULTIMATUM.¹

DR. STORRS's intervention in behalf of the Prudential Committee of the American Board will, we trust, serve to dispel several illusions.

First. The illusion that the existing dissatisfaction with the management of the Board is of no consequence. Dr. Storrs might well be reluctant, as he seems to have been, to enter into a debate which may be continued at the annual meeting over which he is appointed to preside. If he and those to whom he refers, — one of them a conservative member of the committee, — as having created "a certain obligation" for him to speak, had not become aware of the gravity of the situation, we may assume that he would have followed his first intention to remain silent.

Second. The illusion that the doctrinal position of the Board on the question again made prominent is to-day exactly what it always has been. If any of our readers are curious in this matter, and will resort to the documentary proofs which were printed in this "Review," vol. viii. pp. 405 *sqq.*, they will find the materials for an interesting comparison with statements in Dr. Storrs's letter.

Third. The illusion that the management of the Board stands to-day on this question where it stood just before the meeting at Des Moines.

¹ *The Independent*, May 26, 1892, pp. 11, 12.

Then, the standard was the dogma of the universal decisiveness of this life, accepted and held as an indispensable article of the Christian faith. Now, Dr. Storrs, who is a member of the Prudential Committee, as well as President of the Board, runs up an entirely different flag, and claims that it is the flag of the administration.

Fourth. The illusion that the management of the Board is now maintaining its original interpretation of the action at Des Moines. Dr. Storrs defines with rhetorical skill what is now held. How changed the position is any one may see by consulting the account, in the Annual Report for 1887, of the case of "Mr. B." He said exactly what Dr. Storrs affirms now secures a hearty and eager welcome, and for this declaration he was rejected by the Committee acting under "what they understand [understood] to be the instructions given to the Committee by the Board at that meeting," viz. the Annual Meeting at Des Moines.

The illusions to which we have just referred have been more prevalent, we suspect, among the conservatives in the Board than among the liberals. There are others in which the liberals have probably taken the larger share, but these will sufficiently appear as we consider Dr. Storrs's statement of what is, ought to be, and must be, the doctrinal method and rule of the Committee. Perhaps in the interest of reform and progress and an enduring harmony, the dissipation of these illusions will be found to be the special service of this ultimatum.

What, then, is this ultimatum? It may be divided into two parts.

Part I. The Board is not going to change its plan of administration, including, as we understand, the use of "supplementary questions" whenever it [that is, the Prudential Committee] shall think it needful."

Dr. Storrs enters at some length into an account of the occasion and purpose of the amendment to the report of the Committee of Nine which he suggested, and by which the permission to issue such questions was granted. The illustrations which he gives of the necessity for such a liberty of examination are instances where a "crude and partial" doctrinal statement is offered by parties at a distance from the Rooms, or where "vital points" are omitted. Dr. Storrs adds that his amendment commended itself to every one by its mere statement, and that it was unanimously adopted. Of course it was, in this intent. No one, so far as we are aware, has raised any objection to such questions in such cases. The only question is, whether the practice shall continue of inquiring into matters outside of the acknowledged creeds of the Congregational body, and as involved in this, whether this was the meaning of the Board in its action at Minneapolis. We understand Dr. Storrs to affirm that this was intended, that the practice ought to continue, that it is factious to object to it, that it ought not to be discussed, and that if it is discussed one "may as well go hunting for the lost Pleiad" as expect that anything can be done to "increase the efficiency of the Board." Why any-

thing should be done for such an end in a corporation whose "plan of administration" has already attained to immutability is not clear. Perhaps we are extending the scope of Dr. Storrs's rhetoric beyond his meaning. He is specifically referring to a scheme of which he approves for a "permanent" reconstruction of the Prudential Committee. But on the whole we think we have fairly caught the spirit of his contention — or ultimatum. No further change can be permitted in the way of limiting the powers of the Committee. All that was done at Minneapolis was to transfer the power of questioning from the Home Secretary to the Prudential Committee. They may question just as before, as respects range of topics and the kind of scrutiny employed.

If Dr. Storrs's dictum, "This is what was done at Minneapolis, and all that was done," is indeed the conclusion of the whole matter, then we call for the *publication of the statement of facts which was carefully prepared by the Committee of Nine, but was withheld in the interest of a peaceful change, and which shows by numerous details what this kind of scrutiny must mean*, even though conducted by a Committee and not by a single Secretary. We think that Dr. Alden will scarcely refrain from smiling at Dr. Storrs's eulogy of his "exemplary" "meekness and patience" under the change accomplished at Minneapolis by those who "felt gravely suspicious" of his "fairness," when he reads Dr. Storrs's exposition of what was really done, and which is beyond any further discussion or change. A man who not only sees his own policy enthroned, but immortalized, may well afford to be meek; but why should Dr. Storrs thus dash his picture? Perhaps he will recall a scene at Minneapolis in which he was himself a prominent actor. Dr. Walker, the chairman of the Committee of Nine, in enforcing the recommendations presented by him for action, began to draw from the carefully arranged and sifted facts collected in the investigation which had taken place of the methods pursued at the Rooms. He gave some details of a single case, we think of a second, and was proceeding to a third. His hand was raised, holding the record. The President interposed in a pathetic and imploring tone, exclaiming, "Don't! Don't!" or words to this effect. Dr. Taylor repeated the same intercession. The speaker stood holding the record in his uplifted hand, in a silence so intense as to be almost unbearable and for a moment which seemed to be lengthening out beyond measurement, then dropped his hand, and the record was left untold. We had hitherto supposed that no intelligent man, at all acquainted with the meaning of that moment, would ever venture to suggest that "all that was done" at Minneapolis was to transfer Dr. Alden's scrutinies into opinions which the churches agree in regarding as matters of private opinion and personal liberty, from him to other men. Nor when Dr. Storrs affirmed at Minneapolis so emphatically and impressively that the new policy — which the Home Secretary had characterized as a "radical change" in the methods of the Board — should be

"frankly, cordially, effectively, and completely carried out," can we suppose that the speaker was not understood, by many at least, to pledge himself to resist any such practical nullification of the spirit and intent of the Investigating Committee's report as has now been effected. Not that any supposed the doctrinal basis of the Board to have been changed, nor its cautionary rule adopted at Des Moines repealed, but that a new spirit, a "radical change" of method, in dealing with applicants was to be followed. But what do we see? Substantially the old questions are repeated. Not only is "the decisiveness of the present life" made prominent as before, but inquiries are pressed upon other topics, outside the creeds, under discussion, respecting which members of the same household of faith are not agreed, and there is a recognized liberty of opinion. Indeed, it is claimed by the Home Secretary that the Board at Minneapolis enjoined an increased strictness of doctrinal examination, and this not simply to ascertain whether the candidate holds the working theology of the churches as expressed in the leading creeds, but whether he can square his utterances to a particular type of theology, held by only a section — large and important, it may be, yet only a wing — of the Board's constituency. Dr. Storrs's rule, together with his indorsement of the existing practice of the Committee, gives apparently his full approval to a participation by the churches' missionary Board in theological and critical questions such as those of natural or conditional immortality, or of the higher criticism. We might suppose that he had overlooked this extent of the Committee's theological inquiries, if the matter had not been so prominent in the discussion into which he enters, and if it were not understood that he is kept informed of the weekly doings of the Committee. We are constrained, therefore, to accept his ultimatum as intended to cover these questions, and other similar ones that may arise, and to attribute this length and breadth to the permission of "supplementary questions" secured at Minneapolis by his amendment.

One other point in this connection deserves notice. The large minority of the Prudential Committee, who supported Dr. Storrs in his unavailing efforts to secure the appointment of Mr. Covell, have resisted in the decision and *in toto* the issuance, under the Minneapolis rule, of "supplementary questions" to candidates who accept the creeds. This shows that they do not interpret that rule as justifying the present practice, whatever may be said for the formal correctness of Dr. Storrs's interpretation. Nor do we think that those of the Committee of Nine who were present at Minneapolis anticipated that under cover of an amendment providing for "supplementary questions" a method of inquiry would be formally instituted, as has been done the present year by the Prudential Committee, which renews a large part of the serious evils which it was hoped had been remedied. If we understand Dr. Storrs, he pronounces this abuse to be remediless.

Yet it is but a comparatively small matter whether Dr. Storrs's inter-

pretation of the action at Minneapolis is complete or not. Minneapolis is already nearly two years behind us. There will be other Annual Meetings; and Dr. Storrs little understands the existing and growing dissatisfaction with the methods of the Committee in this matter of "supplementary questions," if he supposes that it can be suppressed by an appeal to any past action of the Board, or by any assumption of its finality.

Part II. Dr. Storrs offers the second part of his ultimatum in the form of a citation of four cases and of a summary of the rule they supply. Two of the cases represent successful applications for appointment; two the reverse. One candidate (the "Mr. A." of the Annual Report of 1887) said: "I hold the hypothesis of a future probation for those who have not the gospel;" another ("Mr. C."), "I do believe that it ['probation after death *as before explained*,' these words which we have italicized are omitted in Dr. Storrs's supply of a subject] is 'Scriptural,' not as explicitly revealed and enforced, but as in harmony with Scripture; 'important,' not as being a central and fundamental doctrine of Christianity, but because it honors Christ in giving completeness to his work." These applicants were rejected. Another ("Miss P.") said: "I do not know what will be God's dealings with those who have never known Christ, and who therefore can neither accept nor reject Him in this life. That question I must leave to God's justice and mercy."¹ This person was appointed to be an assistant missionary. Still another said, five years later, "As to how God will deal with those who have had no opportunity of hearing of Christ in this life, I do not know. I leave them in the hands of a just and loving God. The Scriptures do not seem to be wholly clear in the matter. It is a question which does not affect my working theology." This applicant (like "Mr. A." and "Mr. C.," the son of a missionary) has been appointed to be a missionary of the Board since the special discussion, now going on, arose.

Having made prominent these facts, together with a reference to his desire to see Mr. Covell appointed, for which he says, "I worked . . . with all my strength," but unsuccessfully, "*the majority of the Committee*" (italics ours) not regarding him as "within the lines which I had traced," Dr. Storrs thus comments:—

"On the ground thus outlined, in a rough-and-ready fashion, I for one still stand, absolutely. If one says, as was said by the candidate nearly six years ago: 'I hold the hypothesis of future probation for those who have not the gospel,' my answer must be: 'Very well; we don't question your sincerity or your Christian integrity; we hope you will do well wherever you are; but on that basis we fail to see why you should be sent, or anybody else, at great cost and risk of life, to preach the gospel to those for whom waits a probation in the Beyond, when the body and its passions, the world and its temptations, shall have all passed away.' But if one says, as later candidates

¹ We will quote later the words which immediately precede these, which Dr. Storrs cites, and give some further account.

have said in effect, 'I don't know. It is n't revealed; I leave the whole matter in the hands of a just and merciful God; and any thought or hope which I may have about it will have no effect on my missionary labor,' I should send him, otherwise approving him, with all my heart, and with great expectations. This was the plan of administration ratified at New York; and, as I have supposed, as clearly settled and as fairly carried out in the last year as has been the movement of the Connecticut River. We have been, as I conceive, agreed upon this: A man may be as orthodox as the Catechism, and as colorless in spirit as its gray wrapper; we don't want him. Another may be as lively as the last novellet, and as eccentric in religious opinion; we have no use for him. We want character, manhood, energetic purpose, Christian consecration, first of all, with probable aptness for reaching men's minds; and then we want the old Faith, thoroughly believed, energetically felt, with no counteracting strain upon it from any conviction that future chances are to come which may make the present preaching of it practically superfluous or positively dangerous. I believe that the Board, in its great majority, with the churches behind it, stand now as squarely and solidly on this ground as ever before; and I no more look for substantial change in this general position than I look to see June and November changing places."

The whole matter is then summed up as follows:—

"So far as the doctrine of Future Probation is concerned, these questions have always contemplated and met, as I understand it, one of two answers: 'Yes, I hold it;' or, 'I don't *know* anything about it.' If the first answer has been given, the Committee, I presume, has declined to make the appointment. It certainly ought to have done so. It would puzzle the astuteness of the proverbial Philadelphia lawyer to see how it could do otherwise while remaining faithful to the repeated and unrepealed instructions of the Board. If the other answer has been given, . . . other qualifications of character, health, mental vigor, zeal for work, being found sufficient, he has been cordially and even eagerly appointed."

It is well, for the sake of definiteness, that Dr. Storrs has cited cases and given his judgment upon them, and not merely attempted to formulate the rule. So far as we are aware, not one of those whom the Committee has rejected for their views respecting a future opportunity of grace has said, I hold the "doctrine of Future Probation." One, "Mr. C.," used an expression which may be thought to imply this; but this does not represent his exact position. Further, no one, we presume, would fail to affirm "I don't *know* anything about it," if Dr. Storrs's italics represent his meaning. In fact, we think it will be found that most of them have practically said this. It will suffice to adduce Dr. Storrs's strongest case. "Mr. C." informed the Committee that Rev. Robert A. Hume's "position as published is substantially that taken by Mr. A. and me." He further stated to a large and influential council which ordained him as a foreign missionary, and supported his renewed application for appointment, and this statement was before the Committee when it finally rejected him:—

"Those who do not hear the message in this life, *I trustfully leave to God.*

I do not claim to know God's method of dealing with them. But I do not refuse to think about them. I entertain in their behalf what I conceive to be a reasonable hope that *somehow*, before their destinies are fixed, there shall be revealed to them the love of God in Christ Jesus. In this, *as in every question to which God has given no distinct answer*, I merely claim the liberty of the gospel." (Italics ours.)

Indeed, in the very paragraph from which Dr. Storrs quotes, the candidate had said : —

"It is not a fair statement of my attitude toward the dogma in question to say that it enters into the 'warp and woof' of my convictions, for it might be eliminated without destroying the fabric of my belief. Therefore, I would with special earnestness disclaim the phrase that to my mind this dogma is 'a part of the substance of the gospel.' It is rather a corollary and inference to be deduced from the positive teaching of Scripture."

It is easy, of course, in a rough and unsympathetic way to affirm that there is no difference between a "hypothesis" and a "doctrine," or between an "inference" and an article of faith, or a "reasonable hope" and a revealed truth which forms an integral part of the substance of the gospel; but Dr. Storrs we have not been wont to associate with men who thus misuse the English tongue. Has any one of the rejected candidates spoken of any article of the creeds which they have accepted as a "hypothesis"? Has any one referred to either of the fundamental beliefs or "vital points" which Dr. Storrs enumerates, "inspiration, atonement, regeneration, the future life, or the person of Christ," as these enter into the acknowledged creeds of the Congregational body, as hypotheses, or inferences, or opinions, or dogmas, or as merely a "reasonable hope"? Dr. Storrs well knows that the word "doctrine" carries with it associations of a Scriptural and divine authority which no one of those who ought, it is claimed, to be rejected has ever connected with his views of a future opportunity.

When we come, however, to Dr. Storrs's ultimatum, as expressed in his judgment of particular cases, we find that he leaves no ambiguity as to those who are to be rejected. We have a peremptory decision and dictum. A man like the Reverend William H. Noyes, — the "Mr. C." of the "Annual Report," — although approved by the churches, approved as a foreign missionary, working to-day in perfect harmony with the missionaries of the Board, preaching no other gospel, is presented as wholly beyond the line within which appointments can be made. June will as soon become November, and November June, as that this fixed law should change. This is Dr. Storrs's doctrinal ultimatum. It is well at least to have reached the real question at issue, and to have done with methods and expedients, as in themselves sufficient, and most assuredly with the ambiguities and manipulations and subtle casuistries which become almost inevitable when no clear principle of action is determined upon.

It is well also to have the issue in a concrete form. Dr. Storrs has selected his man. We are most happy to agree with the choice. Dr. Storrs says, in effect: The Board should not, will not, appoint such a man as Mr. Noyes. We reply: The Board ought to appoint such a man, and will, when it understands the case, and is ready to be guided by the judgment and will of the churches. Let us delay a moment to make the issue perfectly plain. We take Mr. Noyes as a representative case. We set aside, therefore, incidental qualifications which may be purely personal to him,—his early training in a missionary family, his many claims through the past associations of his life. We would emphasize, however, as an essential part of the issue, his mental and physical qualifications for service, his superior education, his possession of precisely those qualities which Dr. Storrs emphasizes as wanted, “character, manhood, energetic purpose, Christian consecration, first of all, with probable aptness for reaching men’s minds.” No one will deny any of these qualities to Mr. Noyes. We will add, with Dr. Storrs, as rightfully required by the churches: “The old Faith, thoroughly believed, with no counteracting strain upon it from any conviction that future chances are to come which may make the present preaching of it practically superfluous or positively dangerous.” We only ask at this point, What is the “old Faith”? Is it a Faith that is perpetually renewed? Is it the Faith of the churches that sustain the Board? Is it the Faith set forth in the Apostles’ Creed, in the Nicene Creed, in the acknowledged symbols of the Congregational body? Or is it some one’s interpretation of that belief, and determination to maintain this interpretation, after the churches have passed beyond it and left it behind? We know not what was in Dr. Storrs’s thought in writing these words. It could not have been Dr. Alden’s dogma, for Dr. S. has the “brightest hopes,” in which we are happy to participate, of a recent appointee who sets aside that tenet as of Scriptural obligation. We will not suppose that he intends to include in it anything more than the doctrines commonly held in the Congregational churches, and *as* commonly held, that is under the principle of Biblical authority and the continuous expression of them in the life and usages of these churches. This, at any rate, is the sense in which we adopt his words, and we mean by them that the Board ought not to appoint as missionaries men who adopt any solution of the problem presented by the condition and history of heathenism which contradicts the Christian creed, or which conflicts with the supreme motive to missionary consecration. On this latter point, however, it is not permissible to go outside of the creeds and introduce consequences for which they lay no foundation. If, for instance, the creeds do not require a man to maintain Dr. Alden’s dogma, it is not legitimate to say that a man cannot have the missionary motive because he is not moved by this dogma. We suspect that Dr. Storrs has not freed his reasoning from this fallacy. We would add our belief that

Mr. Noyes has made objectively and palpably clear the fallacy in question by his consecrated life, and by his happy harmony in missionary labors with his real, though not as yet official associates. The true test, whether Mr. Noyes fulfills it, as we believe, or not, is faith in the gospel. It is not the prerogative of any Board or man to prescribe any other. And if a man is otherwise qualified and accepts the recognized creeds, and sincerely desires and resolves, as God shall open the way, to preach the gospel as thus received by the churches that sustain the Board, the Board should send him with the contributions it solicits and receives. This is our issue with Dr. Storrs, and the one now before the Board and the Congregational churches. Dr. Storrs says that a man, in all other respects entirely qualified, shall not be sent, if he thinks it to be a reasonable, and in a large view a Scriptural hope that He who gave himself for all will find some way to bring to bear upon all the motive of his dying and constraining love. We might contend, and facts becoming more and more numerous and emphatic are beginning to confirm the plea, that such a sense of the greatness of Christ and his love indicates a man especially fitted to be sent. But this is not our argument here. We simply say: Dr. Storrs's ultimatum excluding such a man is open to fatal objections.

SOME of these objections are as follows: —

1. It is a new dogmatic dictum or rule, which rests on no doctrinal principle.

The new rule starts with the concession that a candidate may put in as a part of his application the statement that the Scriptures do not teach the universal decisiveness of this life. On the question of God's dealings in grace with what has been hitherto immensely the greater part of the human race, he may say that the Scriptures are not clear, that nothing is revealed which enables him to frame a doctrinal statement. Indeed, if he holds that Scripture is so utterly blank and dumb that he can answer the question, "May there be a future opportunity?" by saying, "I don't *know* anything about it," he is sure of a cordial and eager welcome. The dogma, therefore, that the Scriptures are indecisive is now at a certain premium. Now on this basis it would be supposed that the rule would be framed in this wise: Since the Scriptures do not exclude the thought that God's redemptive purpose for humanity — the American Board started with the realization, in the churches and theology which had previously accepted a limited atonement, of the universality of that sacrifice — may extend in its method of recovery beyond the narrow limits of this earthly life, we may not forbid your entertaining this hope. We only caution you against a dangerous and divisive use of it; against teaching it as of faith; against wresting it from its proper uses as men have done even with positive teachings of Holy Writ, the doctrines, for instance, of dependence on divine grace, regeneration, unconditional pre-

destination, and Christ's relation to his elect. It would seem to be evident without any argument that if the only rule of faith, the word of God contained in sacred Scripture, authorizes us to believe that Christianity is God's search for the lost, and that in purpose this search is universal, and if they do not exclude a hope that, if necessary to its full accomplishment, this search will follow those not otherwise reached beyond the grave, the rule of such a board of doctrinal examiners, it would seem to go without saying, must follow these lines of the rule of faith, not including what they exclude, nor shutting out what they permit.

What now do we see in the rule as laid down by Dr. Storrs? First a concession that a candidate may hold that the Scriptures do not decide against a future opportunity for those who have not the gospel, and then a prohibition from making use of this concession; first a permission to hold that the Scriptures leave room for a hope, then a refusal to allow such a hope to be held; first an eager welcome to the man who holds that Scriptures authorize no dogma, then a rejection in the name of the Lord of the man who says, if Christ died for all, then I may hope that all will somehow come to the knowledge of such love; first an approval of the principle that no dogma can be stated, then a setting up one in the region affirmed to be beyond dogma. In a word, the rule begins with applauding an applicant who says, "I don't know anything about it," and ends with setting up a doctrine competent only to omniscience. Such are the absurdities of this new rule.

But its entire destitution of any principle will, perhaps, be even more evident by a glance at its evolution. The process has been, from the beginning to its present stage of being, a series of makeshifts, controlled by no principle save one that was virtually abandoned at the first move, and which remains afterwards chiefly as a desire to retain so much of what had been deserted as is practicable.

First there was set up the dogma of the universal decisiveness of this life. This was presented to applicants as something which must be held in order to an appointment. It was maintained as an essential doctrine of Christianity, a definitely revealed article of faith. The dogma was no novelty, but had been held for generations as an indisputable teaching of Scripture. There is nothing surprising in its survival in the minds of a majority of those who ten years ago were intrusted with the control of the affairs of the Board. What is noteworthy is that they were so little influenced by the change in interpretation of the Scriptures and the understanding of their scope and limitations which was in progress, and especially that they stubbornly refused at first to tolerate any dissent. Against all efforts to conform the practice of the committee to that of the churches sustaining the Board, against the private and public remonstrances of the wise President of the Board, the Committee perseveringly adhered to the dogma we have stated. The Board, largely though indirectly and naturally formed by the manage-

ment, and successively recruited for the contest, passed resolutions which were interpreted as leaving no alternative to the most rigid application of the contested dogma. Between the cases of "Mr. A." and "Mr. C.," cited by Dr. Storrs from the Annual Report, is that of "Mr. B." He said:—

"I am not prepared to affirm that those are lost who have not heard the gospel in this life. . . . I do believe that the general tenor of the Scriptural teaching is that 'now is the day of salvation,' and this teaching it is my purpose to teach. All that I mean is that as regards the hypothesis of a future probation I do not know. Practically it affects neither my belief nor my teaching."

The Home Secretary sent to this candidate these words from a leaflet:—

"On this point also [the universal decisiveness of the present life] it will not do for a religious teacher to say: 'I do not know.' He ought to know. . . . This is not a subject on which it is reasonable to believe that a revelation from heaven has taught nothing."

The case was deferred until after the Annual Meeting at Des Moines, and then the candidate, who simply said "I don't *know* anything about it," was rejected by the Committee acting under "the instructions given the Committee by the Board at that meeting."

The year which followed the Des Moines gathering was one of widespread and almost continuous discussion. As it was wearing away, a lady (Miss P. of the Report) applied for appointment as an assistant missionary.

She stated that she had "never studied on doctrinal subjects," and did "not feel competent to express an opinion on them;" and added: "I do not know what will be God's dealings with those who have never known Christ, and therefore can neither accept nor reject Him in this life. That question I must leave to God's justice and mercy,"—the phrase now so eulogized. The Home Secretary was much dissatisfied, and was understood positively to disapprove her appointment. He labored with her in his customary way. Meanwhile the rumor that he was opposed to her appointment brought on a tremendous private pressure from without. The Secretary yielded in his equally well known way. He recommended her appointment, with an "understanding;" and she was accepted, whether with or without the "understanding" we cannot say. The storm had already gathered, which soon broke at Springfield. Not yet was any missionary appointed who was an agnostic. This precedent, however, had been made,—an applicant may be appointed as an assistant missionary who has never studied theology, and gives assurance that she will "emphasize not one but *all* of Christ's teachings," even though she can only say with respect to the heathen, I leave them "to God's justice and mercy." Then came the letter of Dr. Storrs accepting the presidency of the Board, in which discriminations on subjective or personal grounds were suggested in the cases of

applicants who could not subscribe to Dr. Alden's dogma. The President was not then a member of the Committee, and two years followed in which the service of the Board was deteriorated to an almost incredible degree. The situation became so intolerable that a spontaneous demonstration at New York adverse to the management, and unexpected by it, became so irresistible that a Committee of Investigation was appointed. The President made his notable utterance respecting the "two wings," and, with the Vice-President, was put upon the Prudential Committee. Much was hoped from this change, but in the case of Mr. Covell, the President and Vice-President were defeated in their endeavors, and for this or more interior causes the former's elaborate scheme of personal discrimination never had much effect beyond, perhaps, helping to break down the traditional dogma, making it at least a matter not of unquestionable divine authority but of "private interpretation."

Mr. Covell withdrew from the manipulation to which he was subjected in disgust, and it seemed as though self-respectful and thoughtful men would pretty much cease to be longer available for the Board. Meanwhile, under the storm of criticism that arose, the supporters of the administration had not infrequently made prominent the precedent established in the case of the assistant missionary to which we have referred. It was, however, shorn of its adjuncts, and the theology of the Board, once so stalwart, contented itself with the pious prescription: Say that you leave the heathen to the justice and goodness of God, and all will be well with you. One condition, it would seem, was still at least implicit: In leaving the heathen to God, do not permit yourself to hope that He can grant to any of them a future opportunity. The objective requirement was thus reduced, and the subjective conditions were less inquired into. A suggestion from Mr. Noyes's case may also have been gaining in consideration. He had said: "Those who do not hear the message in this life, I trustfully leave to God. I do not claim to know God's method of dealing with them. But," he had added, "*I do not refuse to think about them.*"

The way was opened to a new rule: "Leave all to God, and do not think." This seems to be about the stage which is pronounced to be final in Dr. Storrs's ultimatum. His rule is not quite so pointed, but it excludes any thinking which discovers any light in Scripture or reason which can relieve the terrible darkness of the ordinary view of the "doom of the heathen." A man at any rate must not think in any way which will give him cheer and comfort in his personal adjustment to this dark problem, and form a part of his speculative theology, and be of service, perchance, to other minds in distress, although all this simply makes him more real, earnest, and devoted in preaching the "old faith."

We have thus in these few years this rapid succession of rules:—

1. The rule of the universal decisiveness of this life, accepted as an essential article of the Christian faith. The missionary "ought to

know." 2. The rule, for an assistant missionary, at least: She may be appointed (with an "understanding"?) *even though* she does n't know, but leaves the whole question to God. 3. The original rule, modified by the consideration of various subjective conditions, to be ascertained by conference. A man may say "I don't know," or even "I hope," if he does not say it too loud, or make too much of it. 4. The original rule wholly abandoned, with its premise of Scriptural authority, and a new one established which welcomes the man who says boldly, "I don't *know* anything about it."

And this rule, having this genesis, is now announced as the ultimatum! In reality the new rule is simply the last one in a series of endeavors to find a lodgment for a night's rest. It maintains no doctrine, states no doctrine, proceeds upon no theological principle. It is, from beginning to end, an abandonment of doctrine. We can respect the men who accepted and insisted upon the universal decisiveness of this life, under the conviction that this is the teaching of God's holy Word. But when this ground is no longer held, and a retreat is made into the regions of ignorance, the attempt to draw lines is simply futile. Scripture does not authorize them. Reason cannot defend them. Experience proves them to be unavailing.

2. The new rule is an arbitrary use of power, and an infringement upon the rights of the Board's constituency.

Its arbitrariness is shown in its lack of a principle. So long as the discouragement or rejection of persons desirous of service under the Board proceeded from a conviction that the Bible leaves the church no alternative but to maintain the dogma of the universal decisiveness of this life, the practice, however inconsiderate, was not intrinsically arbitrary. It rested on a principle and maintained what was held to be a doctrine. But when the original basis and premise is no longer asserted and insisted upon, the enforcement of successive rules whose rightfulness depends solely upon what is thus practically renounced is a mere exercise of arbitrary power. Whence is such authority to be derived? Not from the Prudential Committee. It is an executive committee, and in other societies is usually so denominated. It claims to be acting under instructions from the Board, — instructions, however, which it interprets now, if Dr. Storrs's statements and its own action may be accepted as proof, directly contrary to what it did six years ago, and which it has known how to construe in many ways as purely cautionary. If this is a right construction, which we do not dispute, and if the Board's approval from year to year of the Committee's modification of their practice, until now they approve of what precisely they condemned a little more than five years ago, justifies it, then the Board has itself waived the principle of the binding character of the old dogma of the practically universal exclusion of the pagan world from a Christian opportunity of

grace. The Board, therefore, has no more authority to prescribe such rules as the Committee is enforcing than have its agents. The ground and principle of authority are surrendered. It may now, it is proclaimed, be held lawfully that the Scriptures are not decisive in the matter. That is, the old dogma is no longer of faith. Then, we say, a rule which depends upon this dogma's being of faith has lost its justification. The Board is enacting, or approving in its agents' enactments, rules respecting the faith which it pronounces to have no necessary basis in the faith. All these rules are *ultra vires*. They are a sheer usurpation of authority.

Is it replied, the Board has not renounced the original basis of the rule by which the candidates were rejected? Then the Board has violated its own doctrinal principles and in a manner deserving the severest censure. It has said, this dogma is an essential and indispensable part of Christ's gospel, and then it has appointed men who disbelieve this dogma and will not teach it. That is, the Board has practically betrayed the trust it professes to have received and to be responsible for. When at last we are told that men are eagerly welcomed who say the Scriptures are silent or indecisive on the subject, the matter becomes even a more flagrant violation of its assumed responsibility. But we do not contend that the Board has thus erred. We are ready to concede, at least if the conservatives so understand their own action, that its instructions have been cautionary, not dogmatic and theological. It remains, then, that the instructions of the Board convey no authority to enforce as a necessary article of faith Dr. Alden's dogma, and that the President of the Board is justifiable in saying that this position is not maintained. It stands, then, also, that every rule which implies this retired dogma has lost its validity. Its principle being evacuated, it stands as a mere act of ghostly power. "Thou art a scholar, Horatio, speak to it." Speak to it, every one who thinks enough of his faith to be shocked when what is conceded to be no necessary part of it is still perpetuated as though it were, in irritating, oppressive, and arbitrary rules.

We have said that the new rule is an encroachment on the rights of the Board's constituency.

A close corporation is in danger of forgetting that others than its own membership have rights in it. The Board is mainly what it is by the steadfast support of the Congregational churches of the United States. Every member of these churches has an inherited right in it. If it adopts a policy which shuts out many of its leading ministers from the possibility of service under it, and all who accept their teachings, — these men and those who follow them having an unimpeachable standing in the body from which the Board draws its life, — it violates privileges and claims which it is under sacred obligations to recognize and secure. Fortunately it is no longer necessary to consider what would be the duty of the Board if a portion of its constituency became recreant to the

Faith. The President of the Board by the letter we are considering, the Prudential Committee by its action, the Board by approving these doings, have announced that the dogma of the universal decisiveness of this life is no longer a part of the substance of the gospel, a necessary article of faith. It may be discarded. The obligation therefore rests upon the Board without the slightest possible diminution to treat those who take this conceded position as in full possession of all their privileges and rights under this organization. One of the most sacred of these rights, one of the greatest of these privileges, is that of carrying through its aid the gospel of Christ to the unevangelized. Since the policy of adhering in matters of belief to what the churches do not require, and proscribing those who do not conform to this extra-confessional standard, was determinedly entered upon, one of the most painful facts connected with it, as well as most fitted to excite a just and intense indignation, is the Board's utter forgetfulness of the right to the opportunity of service it should provide of many of our most capable and devoted young men and women.

3. The new rule is a dictum in matters of faith which proceeds from a majority of a Committee appointed by a close corporation, and is constructed in disregard of the acknowledged creeds, and in violation of the doctrinal usages, of the churches which sustain the Board.

It should be remembered that the persons against whom the Committee's proscriptive rules, in their successive phases, have been employed, are all members of evangelical churches in good and regular standing; persons commended for Christian character, and in the cases of applicants for appointment as missionaries, within the ministerial fellowship of the Congregational churches, and in agreement with their fullest and acknowledged creeds. It is such men whom the Committee proscribes. It were enough to call out remonstrance until the evil is remedied, if only one such candidate were rejected. It is often proclaimed that only a few comparatively have been. It is overlooked that under the existing *régime* the cases of actual application from those who judge that all the probabilities of success are adverse, are naturally few. As a matter of known fact, not a few abandon their choice of foreign service, believing that the way is not open to them. How many are diverted no one can say, but there is no reasonable doubt that many are. But this is a digression. It is the character, not the number, of rejected or discouraged applicants, with which we are now concerned. And we repeat what we have just said in order that the fact may be borne in mind: some of the best of those from whom applications should come are those who are spurned, — best in capacity, best in devotion to missionary labor, accredited wherever they go as true and faithful members of our Congregational fellowship, whether as members of churches or as Christian ministers. The new rule would receive some who a short time ago

would have been rejected. We are glad to recognize this advance. But it shuts out those who ought to be received, if the creeds and customs of the churches, and not the will of a close corporation, should decide the question. Not one of those whom the Board shuts out fails of ordination, when he applies for it. Not one would be otherwise than welcome to service under any other of the great societies through which Congregationalists conduct their benevolent operations. What are the facts, in this connection, respecting the honored representative of a leading Congregational church in Boston, now laboring under its commission in Japan? He is one of Dr. Storrs's exemplary cases in the statement of his rule, — a man who ought not to be and will not be appointed by a Board sustained by Congregationalists. He is a graduate of Amherst College and Andover Seminary, and was warmly commended by his instructors, including ex-President Seelye, for appointment. After his rejection by the Committee, a large and representative Council ordained him as a foreign missionary, and advised the church which convened it to endeavor to secure his acceptance by the Board. The overture was rejected, and the church sent him and Mrs. Noyes to Japan independently. He has been working ever since in entire harmony, so far as we are aware, with the missionaries of the Board. The churches which advised and united in his ordination are among the oldest, most liberal, most constant, of the supporters of the Board. Not only their wishes, but the universal practice of the denomination east and west, north and south, is violated in principle by such an exclusion. We have no reason to suppose that an ecclesiastical Council, fairly representative, could be called in any part of the entire domain of our Congregational churches which would advise or act differently from the large and able Council which accredited Mr. Noyes. Dr. Storrs, indeed, claims that the churches are in accord with the Board. As matters appear now to be going, they may have an opportunity sooner than could have been anticipated of deciding this matter for themselves.

Looking at the general situation, three considerations are at once suggested: —

1. The increase of dissatisfaction with the present management of the Board. These successive attempts to make a stand, these grudging concessions bit by bit, show that something has been wrong, and has elicited continued criticism which could only be met by repeated changes. They show, also, the widening and deepening of this dissatisfaction. Such concessions as now are made would not have been thought of five years ago. Dr. Storrs's ultimatum may stiffen the Committee and the Board for a little, but the impatient tone of his letter, as well as the untenableness of his position, gives assurance that matters cannot be thus quieted. The Board, through its Committee, has entered on a path which cannot end in a tangle of absurdities and diplomatic adjustments.

One concession for expediency's sake requires another. It will be compelled to go back to its first principle,—that is, to require what the word of God makes clear. The mission of the Board is to carry to men the gospel. We believe it should cease to act as an independent judge of what the Scriptures require as of faith, that Dr. Hopkins was right when he said that the Committee should be not a theological but a Prudential Committee. But for the present discussion, it deserves to be noticed that a correct principle was employed when an acceptance of Dr. Alden's dogma was insisted on because it was an essential and vital part of Christianity, and is proved to be so by sacred Scripture. Now that this position is given up, the Board will have to let go of all those rules and methods which imply its continued force. Until this is done, there will be constant criticism, attack, yielding, friction, and nothing settled. Men will submit to the Word of God; they will not submit to dicta which do not even pretend to embody its undeniable injunctions.

We met recently with a prominent leader in the work of Christian education in this country, who has recently visited a number of schools, colleges, and other similar institutions at the West. This person's testimony was given to us spontaneously and with much earnestness of manner substantially thus: "Everywhere the question is asked, when will this policy of restriction end?" Dr. Storrs's letter seems to us to indicate that he has no just conception of the amount and force of the existing dissatisfaction. Men are weary of merely prudential efforts to produce quietness.

2. A second reflection is, that this process of settling matters by successive concessions won by constant contentions is fatal to any enthusiasm for the Board among those who supply its need of missionaries. Men can grow enthusiastic over a battle for a principle, they lose respect for those who in serious matters seem to be playing a game of "Hold fast what you can."

Really, there is something pitiable in the sacrifice which the Board is making of its most precious treasures and its golden opportunities. Dr. Storrs says practically: "Stop discussion, raise the extra hundred thousand dollars." Does he realize what such words mean to young men who desire to give their lives to the service of Christ, but are kept back by rules which they readily discern to be arbitrary and destitute of religious authority and doctrinal principle? The Board has already greatly weakened its hold on the young men and women who will be the leaders in Christian work for the next generation. It does not command them to the extent it might and should, and we believe it cannot as at present administered. We say this, not theoretically, but from what we hear and see. Nor only this. It is wasting its influence just at the time when the other societies, at the point where it is quibbling and managing, are administered with liberality and in full accord with the creeds and practice of the churches. It is thus throwing away its chance for men just

when the work at home is becoming most attractive to high-souled, broad-minded, energetic, courageous, and devoted Christian men, — just when the questions of race, social organization, adaptation of Christian effort to conditions now beginning to be carefully studied and imperative in their needs, are enlisting such spirits and summoning them to new and arduous enterprises of benevolence. What is the American Board doing, at such a time as this, to reinforce its appeal to these men? Turning off some of the best of them, — disgusting others, — suggesting that they can be appointed if they will conjure by some dogmatically unprincipled formula, and submit to casuistic distinctions between obscure and obscurer shades of belief, hope, and doubt, if they will wrestle no more with the mysteries of life nor breathe the air of freedom in which their brethren in the ministry of the churches they leave behind them rejoice as an eagle in the sunlight. Oh! the absurdity and the folly, the shame, the untold loss and disaster of it all! And yet one simple principle, which was uttered in the beginning of the conflict in private and in public, in the committee-room at Boston and on the platform at Des Moines, one plain practical word of that statesman, philosopher, friend of missions, whose voice will long be heard in the councils of the Board, as in halls where men are learning to think and to live in the freedom of the spirit of Christ, might settle all the wrangling and clear all the confusion of the hour: "Let the Board follow, not dictate to, the churches. Let the Prudential Committee cease to be a theological and become a Prudential Committee." Then the Board could do its work in peace, and give scope to the nobility of its service and summon men to new enthusiasms.

3. We cannot stop without adverting to one other reflection. The conflict for a reasonable liberty of opinion within the Congregational body is not peculiar to this generation. What is striking is, that it is not now in ministerial bodies, nor in the churches. These have all found or conquered peaceful conditions of religious thought and life for the present at least, whatever the future has in store. The present conflict is in a close corporation. Still the Board is not wholly outside the churches. It depends upon them mainly for its funds, as for its missionaries. It is in an atmosphere in which a contest for liberty within the terms of the gospel has never terminated but in one way.

NOTE.

As we are concluding the preceding article, we are informed that the present week the Prudential Committee has sent to an applicant, who had offered in expression of his faith the familiar "creeds of acknowledged weight," supplementary questions not only upon the relation of this life to the future, but upon other topics. A short time ago such questions, in a case known to us, were reduced to two. Now, to an applicant offering the same creeds, so far at least as the Congregational symbols are concerned, and as the questions are concerned, a larger number is presented. Why this distinction?

Further, it is evident that in the face of all remonstrances the Committee is determined to pursue inquiries beyond the creeds. And yet Dr. Storrs thinks that discussion should cease, so that the contributions may grow.

BIBLICAL AND HISTORICAL CRITICISM.

MARK XVI. 9-20, AND JOHN VII. 53-VIII. 11.

THE genuineness of writings nearly two thousand years old could hardly have failed to be called in question, and with reference to our canonical Gospels the inquiry has probably elicited all that is attainable of external testimony. The result of extended discussion has been, for many minds, to confirm the substantial authenticity of these books, and for not a few to replace the unquestioning faith of a less inquiring age by a corresponding belief based on solid grounds. Indeed, the present tendency of what was destructive criticism is to shorten the interval between the events of our Saviour's life and their records, and to accredit to his immediate followers the traditions contained in those records.

The internal tokens of authorship have even more evidential value than the external proofs. Such tokens may be found in each of the four Gospels, and especially in the second and fourth. Moreover, neither of the Gospels — with the exceptions hereafter to be made — shows any mark of divided authorship, or of other than slight and insignificant accretions or interpolations by later hands. To account for what the Synoptic Gospels have in common forms no part of my present purpose; I have elsewhere given what seems to me a perfectly satisfactory explanation of this phenomenon. Each of the Gospels, taken by itself, seems a continuous story, written by a man who had a distinct conception of the life and character of Jesus Christ, and there are no incidents or utterances out of harmony with that conception, — none which indicate any other than the author's wonted point of view. Then, too, the four Gospels confirm one another's authenticity, inasmuch, in their differences of material and style, with their distinctive marks of separate authorship, there is no discrepancy as to the personage whose history they give. The fourth Gospel, indeed, has in its contents very little in common with the Synoptics; yet its fuller view of the interior life and the spiritual teaching of Christ is but the drawing out, in more ample detail, of traits of mind, soul, speech, and life, of which we have the clear outline in the other three. Each of the four contributes to the perfectness of the picture, while in neither of them is there a line or tint out of keeping with the portraiture in the other three. Still farther, as to what is commonly called the miraculous element in the life of Christ, if that element existed, there is nothing in these narratives which might not have been written by eye and ear witnesses, who described their own remembered impressions of what they saw and heard.¹ In fine, those who believe Christ to have possessed and

¹ The only objection which we anticipate to this statement concerns the cure of the so-called demoniacs. Those who believe in the reality of demoniacal possession of course find no difficulty. If the persons so cured were insane or epileptic patients, and the lookers-on had supposed them possessed by

manifested all of the divine that could be made human, find in these narratives nothing un-Christlike, — nothing that does not correspond in word and deed with their highest Christ-ideal. In saying this we must except two passages, which are found in the long received Greek text of the New Testament, stand without any expression of doubt in our common English translation, and are retained, though printed apart and as of more than doubtful genuineness, in the Revised Version. The only portions of the Gospels which I should want to expunge for the sake of our Divine Master and his religion are these, which have no right to be there.

The first of these passages is Mark xvi. 9-20. This is entirely wanting in the Sinaitic and the Vatican Manuscripts, undoubtedly the oldest extant, also in still existing manuscripts of Armenian and Æthiopic versions which were made in the third or fourth century. In more than forty manuscripts it is inserted, with a note, generally to the effect that the passage is regarded as spurious, and is not contained in the more accurate copies, sometimes, however, with an opposite statement, which is fully as clear a token of disputed genuineness. Some manuscripts and versions give a short and very different ending to the Gospel, after verse 8, and in one manuscript of venerable antiquity both endings are given, each with the note, "This also is extant," showing that neither of them was considered as rightfully belonging where it stood. Origen, from whose writings the Gospels might almost be reconstructed, does not quote from this passage; Eusebius says that it is wanting in most copies and in the most accurate; and Jerome says that it is omitted in almost all the Greek manuscripts that came under his hands.

That Mark should have left his Gospel unfinished is by no means strange, when we consider the precarious hold on life of the early Christian propagandists. That Mark's Gospel was virtually Peter's is a belief resting not only on tradition, but equally on very strong tokens of Peterine authorship. But if Mark wrote as Peter's amanuensis, Peter's imprisonment and martyrdom may have arrested the story abruptly, and in that case the disciple may have preferred leaving it unfinished to writing a conclusion of his own, especially if he was not personally cognizant of the resurrection and the events that followed it. Or Mark's own career may have been suddenly arrested; for the narrative of his latter years rests on very slender authority. That a close should be added was almost inevitable. Morally speaking, it was not a case of forgery. Our notions of literary property and of the inviolableness of authorship are modern. No one in the second or third Christian century would have regarded himself as performing other than a right, necessary, and pious work in finishing to the best of his ability an unfinished book, and the various devices by which in our time the honest finisher of another's work would take care to discriminate between the original and the supplement have come into use since the introduction of printing. Copyists who

evil spirits, we should expect from them very much such accounts as we have, especially when we consider that Jesus himself would have spoken on such occasions in the Oriental idiom, rife with personification and apostrophe. Still farther, if a herd of swine, alarmed by the concourse of people, had rushed down a precipice into the lake, what more natural than that bystanders should suppose that the demons let loose had entered into the swine? Indeed, a person who had no belief in demons might have very easily described the scene by saying that the madness passed out of the men into the swine.

were fully aware that the addition was by another hand, if it contained nothing that seemed to them objectionable, would gladly and gratefully have adopted it, oftener than not without comment, and so transmitted it as seemingly genuine to successive generations of copyists.

The verbal construction of this passage shows that it was not written by the author of the book. In the first sentence Mary Magdalene is named as the woman from whom Jesus "had cast out seven devils." She is twice mentioned by Mark in connection with the crucifixion and entombment; and if he had wanted to designate her in this way, he would have done so when she is numbered among those standing by the cross. But the writer of the supplement either meant to tell what Mark had omitted, or else he failed to observe the previous introduction of Mary's name by the evangelist.

In that same sentence "the first day of the week"¹ is designated in a form nowhere else found in the New Testament, while in the second verse of this same chapter Mark had used a form which occurs repeatedly elsewhere.²

The expression "them that had been with him" is peculiar to this closing paragraph, and nowhere else in the New Testament are the apostles thus designated; while the phrase itself was much more likely to have been used at a later period than by one who had been familiarly acquainted with the apostles.

In verses 10 and 11, a demonstrative pronoun is used in a way in which I cannot find it employed anywhere else in the New Testament, in a sense neither demonstrative nor emphatic. "*She*³ went and told them." "*And they*,"⁴ when they had heard that he was alive."

There are, beside, in this short passage some ten or twelve instances in which the writer uses words or phrases peculiar to himself, and unlike those which Mark uses in similar connections. In fine, the style of the passage differs from Mark's style. While perhaps less Hebraistic, it evidently belongs to one less in the habit of writing in the Greek tongue.

This passage would hardly claim special notice, and we would prefer to leave it undisturbed in its place, were it not for the false and utterly unchristian notions that have been derived from it. We refer especially to the words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." This is the only instance in the New Testament in which salvation is represented as contingent on anything else than character. Jesus never requires specific beliefs of any kind as the condition of his or of God's approval. "If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love." "He that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven" designates the object of the divine favor. In like manner Peter says: "In every nation he that feareth God and worketh righteousness is accepted with him." Paul, indeed, in his two controversial epistles, shows that faith in Christ supersedes the Jewish ritual; but with him the substance of doctrine is that "the grace of God that bringeth salvation" teaches "that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, righteously, and godly in this present world." James lays such intense and sole stress on character that Luther, who differed from him, called his epistle — that transcendently admirable compend of Christian ethics — an epistle of straw.

¹ Πρώτη σαββάτου.

² Ἐκείνη.

³ Τῆς μίας σαββάτου.

⁴ Κάκεινοι.

As to the idea that baptism is essential to salvation, no inference of the kind can be drawn from any other passage in the New Testament. Baptism is not even of Christian origin. There is abundant evidence that it was practiced by the Jews for proselytes and their families. That it was no new thing appears from the question put to John: "Why baptizest thou, then, if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that prophet?" — implying that this was the normal mode of initiation into a new religious régime. In this sense Christ prescribed it as the outward sign of admission to his church from Judaism or Paganism, and it is impossible to determine from the New Testament alone whether his purpose was that it should ever be other than a token of proselytism. We cannot, indeed, doubt that the same equally appropriate sign of the induction of the convert or the child from the outside world into the church has his approval and benediction, and my own belief is that it was included in his design and appointment. But had the salvation of Paul's converts depended on their baptism, it is inconceivable that he should have spoken of this rite with an indifference which from any one else might seem unbecoming, thanking God that he had baptized only two persons in Corinth, and then by an afterthought recalling one other instance. Had he ever heard of the saying of Jesus quoted by Mark's continuator, he would never have suffered a convert of his to pass from his hands till he had seen him safely through the water.

The earliest trace of a belief in baptism as essential to salvation is in the "Shepherd" of Hermas, which probably belongs late in the second century, and the earliest token that we have of the existence of this spurious close of Mark's Gospel is in the treatise of Irenæus "Against all Heresies," which bears nearly the same date. In the "Shepherd" the apostles are said to have baptized the Old Testament saints in Hades, in order to secure their admission into heaven. From that time the church doctrine of the necessity of baptism and of its efficacy in removing all sin seems to have been established. Hence Christian parents had the rite performed as soon as possible after a child's birth, trusting in the earlier time to penitence, and at a later period to the ritual of penance, for the cleansing from post-baptismal sin. On the other hand, adults who wanted to prolong the privilege of sinning postponed baptism till they were consciously in the shadow of death, that they might make the best of both worlds.

The theory of the Roman Church, certainly from the third century to the present day, has been the non-salvability of the unbaptized, even of new-born infants. The devices employed to cheat Satan out of his prey when the death of an infant was anticipated are a curious and a very unedifying chapter of church history. In the interest of mercy, the baptismal use of wine was authorized in an emergency when water was unattainable. In one recorded instance of sudden illness in a waterless desert sand was used; but as the baptized person did not die, while the baptism was held to have been hypothetically valid, it was decreed that water was essential to the completion of the rite. Lay-baptism, when the services of a priest could not be obtained, has always been regarded by authorities in the Roman Church as of saving efficacy.

We must not forget that in giving baptized infants a place in heaven the Roman Church was less unchristian than those Protestant sects that have maintained belief in the indiscriminate damnation of all infants, — a dogma which had its poet laureate in Michael Wigglesworth, and, as we

trust, its last champion on earth in Rev. Thomas Williams, who has but lately gone where he must have learned the difference between Moloch and Jehovah.

The English Church has retained in full the Roman doctrine of baptism. Its burial service is not used "for any that are not baptized," nor for excommunicated persons, nor for suicides, while for all who do not fall under one of these heads, even for notorious profligates, it expresses thanks for their delivery from the miseries of this world, and the hope that they rest in Christ. Unbaptized infants cannot have the rites of Christian burial, and until the passage of the recent Burials-Bill, they could not be interred in "consecrated ground," a term which included by far the greater part of the English cemeteries. The popular belief in England has been that the Quakers, because unbaptized, are excluded from the hope of heaven. When Bishop Stanley, in his cathedral at Norwich, preached a funeral sermon on Joseph John Gurney, than whom there could have been no more Christlike man, while there were many who admired and applauded his courage, he was utterly condemned by the more rigid churchmen for recognizing as a Christian a person who, as spiritually a *felo-de-se* by remaining unbaptized, must needs have been hell-bound. Indeed, fully half the Bishop's sermon is taken up in proving that so saintly a man as Gurney could not be shut out of heaven for lack of the external seal of the visible church.

In accordance with the established belief, great stress has been laid on the baptism of children as soon as possible after birth. Bishop Charles Wordsworth's mother was a Quaker, and was baptized on the day of her marriage. He thinks that it was on account of her indifference to the rite that he was not baptized till he was six months old, which, he says, "has always been a cause of some uneasiness," of course, in the thought of what might have been his doom had he died in early infancy. Archbishop Tait, in his stormy administration, encountered no hostility so bitter as in his advocacy of the Burials-Bill, one of the chief objections to it being that it opened the churchyards for the interment of the unbaptized; and among the strongest arguments against the bill it was urged that under the old régime dissenters fared no worse than the unbaptized children of churchmen. It should not be forgotten that in the English, as in the Roman Church, lay-baptism is valid. Not many years ago, a child born in an American family temporarily resident in England, died a few hours after its birth. The mother sent for the clergyman of the parish to perform a funeral service. He declined on the ground that the child had not been baptized. The nurse, who seems to have been well instructed, interposed and said that she, seeing that the child could not live, had herself administered baptism. The minister then said, "What this woman has done, though irregular, is enough to take the curse of God off from the child," and he performed the desired service. It would be well worth inquiry whether that poor man had derived a single idea from any other portion of the Gospels except that spurious verse. Did he suppose that the children on whom Jesus laid his hands in blessing had first been baptized?

The service of the American Episcopal Church indicates probably as wide a departure from the English in this respect as could have obtained the sanction of the prelates whose approval was a prerequisite to the consecration of the American bishops. It excludes "unbaptized adults" from the rites of Christian burial, and in the baptismal rubric, the min-

ister is enjoined to "often admonish the people, that they defer not the baptism of their children longer than the first or second Sunday after their birth, or other holy day falling between, unless upon a great and reasonable cause." While with the intelligent members of the American Church baptism is properly regarded as a sacred and salutary rite, not to be neglected or unduly postponed, it is hardly possible that the Roman and Anglican theory can have any strong foothold among them.

But there are in other quarters traces of this superstition about baptism. Within a few weeks the question, "Can a person be saved without baptism?" was discussed in one of the principal Baptist churches in this State. Of course adult baptism by immersion was meant; for the Baptists recognize no other form of the rite as valid. The question then was, "Are we Baptists to have heaven to ourselves alone, and are all the rest of the human race, including those around us whom we call our fellow-Christians, going into perdition?"

It is impossible to overestimate the mischief that has been done by this single spurious text, the anguish which it has caused with reference to the innocent and holy dead, and the agony of parents in committing their children with a prayerless funeral to an unhallowed grave. Still worse, even, is the reproach that has been cast on the character of God, in making salvation often contingent on conditions for which no human being can be held accountable. This verse has borne no small part in the past in cherishing those repulsive views of God the Father, which have made Christ seem the refuge from his wrath, rather than the incarnation of his infinite compassion (*con-passio*), love, and mercy, thus negating Christ's own words, "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father;" "I and the Father are one."

There is yet another charge against this spurious close of Mark's Gospel. Jesus is represented as saying: "These signs shall follow them that believe: In my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." No promises of this kind are recorded in the other Gospels; and Mark's continuator evidently generalized the two or three instances of the exercise of healing gifts in the Acts of the Apostles, and Paul's suffering no harm from the viper, which the narrator does not represent as miraculous, though the men of Malta thought it so.

Still farther, the nineteenth verse was undoubtedly borrowed from the account of Stephen's vision in the Acts of the Apostles; for while the phrase "sat on the right hand of God" means simply what all Christians believe, the form is not historical, and the other evangelists do not attempt to describe what passed after Jesus was taken from their sight.

Mark's Gospel was undoubtedly the earliest Gospel written in Greek, and was among Luke's authorities in his Gospel, "the former treatise;" while this close of Mark's Gospel indicates an acquaintance with a book which must have succeeded "the former treatise" by several, perhaps many years.

The other spurious passage to which I referred at the outset is John vii. 53-viii. 11, the narrative of the woman taken in adultery. This is wanting in all extant Greek manuscripts of earlier date than the eighth century, except the Cambridge Manuscript (*Codex Bezae*), which probably belongs to the sixth century. It is either wanting or inserted

in the margin in the oldest extant manuscripts of the earlier versions. Origen evidently knew nothing of it. Ambrose speaks of it as undoubtedly spurious. In many of the manuscripts in which it is found it is either written in the margin, or marked with an asterisk or an obelisk; in some it is appended to the Gospel; in some it is inserted between the twenty-first and the twenty-second chapters of Luke's Gospel.

In this short passage there are two designations — one of a place, the other of persons — which occur nowhere else in the Gospel. One is "the Mount of Olives," often used by the Synoptics with reference to various places within the region comprehended under this title, — places which in the fourth Gospel are designated by their local names. The other instance is the mention of "the Scribes,"¹ spoken of in the genuine portion of the Gospels as "the Jews," in the sense of "the hostile Jews," — the term ordinarily rendered *scribe* bearing, in Ephesus, where the fourth Gospel was probably written, an entirely different meaning, as appears from Acts xix. 35.²

If we omit this passage we have an unbroken narrative, in which Jesus holds a continuous conversation on the same day, with the same persons, and in the same tone on his part and on theirs; while if we receive the passage in question as genuine, a night intervenes; in the morning the guilty woman is brought to him in the Temple; when she goes he is left alone there, and he immediately speaks "unto them,"³ there being no persons to whom by any possible construction the pronoun can refer.

Eusebius speaks of a story not unlike this, told by Papias, as being in a no longer extant "Gospel to the Hebrews." It was probably first inserted as an edifying story in the margin of the fourth Gospel by some copyist, and at length taken into the text by a much later copyist, who supposed that it had been accidentally omitted, and that it really belonged in the text.

The circumstances of this narrative are highly improbable. If the woman was legally in custody, the officers of justice would not have lost their hold upon her; while volunteer accusers could hardly have carried her to the Temple in open day without her own consent. Then, too, the Levitical law prescribed stoning only in certain specified cases; we have no evidence that this penalty had been inflicted even in such cases in the later periods of self-rule in Judæa, and at this time the Jews did not possess the right of capital punishment. Then, as to the purpose of ensnaring Jesus, his position with reference to the seventh commandment of the Decalogue must have been too well known to leave any opening for doubt or cavil.

But the sufficient reason for not retaining this narrative in the Gospel is that it places Jesus in a position adverse to that which he constantly maintained. It represents him as taking no cognizance of the woman's present state of mind with regard to her crime, as neither recognizing any expression of contrite sorrow nor exhorting her to repentance, but rather as extenuating her guilt by assuming like guilt on the part of her accusers. That he should have regarded her with pity, and should have

¹ Οἱ γραμματεῖς.

² Ὁ γραμματεὺς, rendered "the town-clerk" in both the common and the Revised Version, but denoting a magistrate who, while having charge of the public archives, possessed authority not unlike that of the mayor of a modern city.

³ Αὐτοῖς.

pledged to her the divine forgiveness if she was truly penitent, would have been in harmony with his spirit and his mission. But that he should have treated her sin so lightly and dismissed her without a word of censure is entirely out of keeping with his wonted method, and we may well be glad that the narrative, as it stands, lacks the sanction, not only of the beloved disciple, but also of the earliest Christian antiquity.

A. P. Peabody.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Patrick Henry. Life, Correspondence, and Speeches. By William Wirt Henry. With Portrait. Vol. I. pp. ix, 622. Vol. II. pp. xv, 652. Vol. III. (Correspondence) pp. 672. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1891. — These three large and handsome volumes give essentially the same result as Professor Tyler's compact biography, except that the Southern feeling is very pronounced in the second volume (as it was in Patrick Henry himself), and that the revolutionary and sub-revolutionary affairs of Virginia generally are given in great amplitude, as indeed they might well be in the life of a man in whose personality Virginia was so thoroughly bound up. The biography shows, without exaggeration, though not without filial emphasis, the large generosity of Virginian statesmanship during this vital time, and the large generosity of Patrick Henry's own statesmanship in helping to broaden the basis of the commonwealth, and to establish the rights of conscience in their fullness.

Mr. Henry hardly brings out as distinctly as Professor Tyler the futility of Jefferson's insinuations of incompetency and idleness against his ancestor's earlier professional life. To most of us, Patrick Henry had appeared as an inspired ignoramus and lounging, who set the country on fire at the beginning, and spent the rest of his life on the strength of this first afflatus. His two later biographers have effectually disposed of this impression. Patrick Henry was not, indeed, in law a Marshall, or in the theory of statesmanship a Madison; but he was, as a jurist, thought worthy by Washington of being offered the Chief Justiceship of the United States, while, as Governor of Virginia in the darkest hour of the Revolution, he was *worthy* to be the Governor of Virginia. The contrast between his own greater and Jefferson's lesser efficiency in this office (of which Henry was only too sensible), though not, after all, so very marked, seems to have been the foundation of the latter's invincible malignity towards him for the rest of his life. Jefferson was a great mind, but can hardly be called a great man, for, as Hildreth remarks, his nature was cast in a feminine rather than a masculine mould, and he did not well sustain the shock of masculine collisions. Henry's absence of gall, sharp as he could be on occasion, seems to have been one great secret of his undying influence in Virginia.

Patrick Henry and Jefferson seem to have diverged in their relations to the Constitution from the time that it went into effect. Jefferson had hardly been so intense against it as it stood, but gave it, when adopted, an anarchical interpretation, culminating in the Resolutions of 1798, which poisoned the whole subsequent temper of the South towards federal authority, and,

as the author reminds us, by no means of the South alone. Patrick Henry, on the other hand, opposed ratification to the very verge of disunion; but when he failed, he loyally, though by no means lovingly, acquiesced, and recognized that his State had established over herself, for general ends, a true national government, of whose powers she individually could no longer judge, opposing all attempts at nullification. "What Charlotte County," said he, "is to Virginia, that is Virginia to the Union." This sound position, from which he never varied, was what brought him around at length from his strained relations to Washington back to the old affectionate cordiality. As for Jefferson's circuitous attempts to bring the tension of these years to a rupture, and the spiteful fling of his party that the Federalists had offered Patrick Henry everything which they knew he would not accept, it is enough to say that they are thoroughly Jeffersonian. It is true, if Henry had not been so immovably hostile to the whole influence of French encyclopædism, Jefferson might have found it easier to forgive him. Patrick Henry's conduct in the whole range of "relative duties" as husband, brother, father, and master seems to have exemplified typically that eminent healthiness resting on un-moved Christian faith, as this deepened and comprehended more and more of the character which appears to be still characteristic of his class of society in Virginia, and not least in southern Virginia. The struggles of his life to find the means of supporting his family of seventeen children are allowed to have ended in a somewhat excessive attachment to the wealth into which his later years opened out. He did not dwell much on his fame, but was only too well pleased with compliments to his property.

Henry's oratory, great as it was, was so largely made up of the personal element as hardly to rank among the very highest, as may be said, perhaps, even of Whitefield and Chatham. As a lawyer, he entered fully into the peculiar morality, or immorality, of his profession, and appears, on occasion, to have been an absolutely consummate master in the art of making the worse appear the better reason.

As a Southerner, it was not without good ground that Patrick Henry recognized in the young John Randolph of Roanoke a probable successor, though the immediate occasion of his favorable judgment of him had nothing to do with sectional matters. The contemptuous and rather selfish readiness of New England and New York to give up control of the Mississippi for present commercial concessions from Spain seems to have always rankled in his mind. The keynote which he set for the South was: "Southern interests will always be sacrificed by the Northern majority." His descendant and biographer holds him to have been a true prophet as to the whole course of the future. He does not explain how this innocent and oppressed section came to suffer such wrongs during a history of seventy-two years, in which she held the keys of power in person for forty-eight, indeed, including servile deputies, for fifty-six, and in which she frightened the North into granting almost everything that she desired, and into surrendering almost everything that she disliked. Jefferson's more ideal vision was, on this side, undoubtedly nobler and worthier of a prophet.

The author bestows what appears to us rather excessive praise on the value of the amendments which his great-grandfather was the chief agent in securing, and the still greater value of those which he would have liked to secure. We own to great doubt whether, the Constitution being what

it is, these earlier amendments have made much difference in its development. There seems a smack of superfluous declamation in them. This chapter, however, has a good many cautionary hints by no means unworthy of being pondered. The biographer cordially admires the Constitution, defects and all, as equally fitted for a narrow territory or for a continent, and emphatically reprobates all pretense that resistance to it has ever rested on any other than a revolutionary right.

The Life has a tone of cordial eulogy, well kept within the limits of demonstrable fact, untinged with bitterness, although some facts have to be mentioned which bear rather bitterly on the great but not magnanimous enemy whose sly spite kept Patrick Henry out of his full rights of renown for so many years.

Christopher Columbus, And how he Received and Imparted the Spirit of Discovery. By *Justin Winsor*. "They that go down to the sea in ships, that do business in great waters, these see the works of the Lord, and his wonders in the deep." (Psalms cvii. 23, 24.) Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. 1891. Pp. xi, 674. \$4.00. — Mr. Winsor might perhaps have rendered his valuable biography still more valuable, if he had not written it in such a constant attitude of pugnacity towards "the canonizers," ecclesiastical and non-ecclesiastical, from Irving and Prescott to De Lorgues. His love of justice sometimes seems to verge on injustice. This appears still more in his designation of Isabella as "an unlovely character, and an obstructor of Christian charity." She may have been this, but it does not appear in the course of his own narrative. On the contrary, for anything that comes to view in this Life, she may have been substantially as gracious and high-minded as Irving or Prescott represents. We have not discovered on what Mr. Winsor rests in accusing her, towards her end, of affecting a disposition of patronage towards Columbus which she no longer felt. We are glad to see that Mr. Winsor describes her as chiefly interested in the new discoveries on their "emotional" — that is, religious — "and intellectual side." He also, we see, does not dispute her sincere displeasure when the natives were enslaved or ill-treated. She was not a Las Casas, it is true, but is it not a rather unmerciful rigor to insist on judging her by our standard, by which Las Casas himself, as a Spanish Catholic of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, might possibly suffer, at least in our self-complacent eyes? We shall, therefore, until better advised, continue to hold her, in Mr. Caldecott's words, "a queen of singularly high and tender soul," though hardly of as unimpeached a truthfulness as her daughter Catherine. Her confessor and her husband seem thus far to have shoulders broad enough to bear the weight of the direful faults into which Spanish bigotry betrayed the impressibility of a female soul. We must own, however, to shivering when we think of some things related of her haughty defiance of the Pope when he threatened her coffers by objecting to her peculiar uses of the Inquisition.

Columbus's own faults Mr. Winsor sets forth with the amplest detail, and fairly luxuriates in them. His want of the commanding soul falls into view at the very first: his utter lack of self-knowledge in stipulating for the viceroyalty of a world when he could hardly govern a ship, and could not at all govern a province; his lack of those elementary instincts of justice and humanity towards the natives which were so quick in Isabella and so luminous in Las Casas, and of which even Ferdinand was not without some trace; the growth or decline of his pious zeal for convert-

ing the natives in almost exact inverse ratio to his prospects of making gain by plundering or enslaving them; his willingness to compel his men to perjury in order, *per fas et nefas*, to turn Cuba into Cathay; his mean readiness, on a self-attested oath, to rob a poor seaman of his subordinate renown and reward; the hysterical vagaries into which his fancy was always ready to fall; the extraordinary closeness of his observation and his incapacity of large or sober induction from it, — all these things seem to be unmistakably in the facts, however mercilessly Mr. Winsor may lie in wait to pelt our unwary admiration or unpermitted charity with them. When we succeed to the holy chair, we think we shall canonize Columbus out of sheer desperation, on the ground that a great deed can hardly be stumbled into by mere mistake, without some answering greatness in the doer.

Mr. Winsor puts an end to the fanciful pictures of frowning convocations of ecclesiastics and professors, gathered to argue down the possibility of a new world out of Aristotle and Joshua, and making us wonder how the poor man ever steered clear of the Inquisition. In his narrative there appears hardly a trace of this. The conference at Salamanca, it is true, reported unfavorably, after a private and informal session; but of course there could be no serious question of orthodoxy if St. Augustine, as Mr. Winsor says, had taught the earth's sphericity, and if one of the things known by heart to the monks of the Middle Ages was a poem anticipating very much such discoveries. The reprobation of Antipodes rested on wholly different grounds. Two fifths of the width of the Atlantic, it must be remembered, was already known, and these floating notions of floating islands and of fixed archipelagoes, in the space which we now know to be almost bare, helped the imagination wonderfully. We remember the beneficent illusions which Schopenhauer, like a great fool as he is, is said to be so severe in criticising, but by which Columbus and his men were lured on day after day until they reached the goal.

What, then, was there so great in Columbus's feat? That is the legendary question, to which we know his legendary reply, which, in Mr. Winsor's emendation, might well have been his answer, as it had really answered other cavaliers somewhere in the time of the earlier Quaternary. The shutting up of eastern routes by the Moslem forced Christian expectation into the southern and the western channel; and at last, when these floating fancies strengthened into the fixed thought of an aspiring imagination, and this kindled a kindred flame in the high imagination of a great queen, the thing was done. The terrors of the Sea of Darkness, in spite of all conjectures, still rested on the minds of common men, and they were dispelled at last because Columbus was not a common man, and because Isabella was not a common woman. The Pilgrim Fathers, too, have been picked to pieces, most authentically, a thousand times. Their thoughts lagged immensely behind their achievements, and the particular performances which they anticipated lagged immensely behind their thoughts. Their holiest purposes, moreover, were crossed and flecked with cupidity and cruelty. Nevertheless, it was rightly said to them, as it might have been rightly said to Columbus and Isabella: "The glory shall be yours to the world's end." Sounder heads than that of Columbus followed him, when the flaming torch of a soaring spirit had lighted the way for them. A few years more, and Cabral struck Brazil in beating down towards the Cape of Good Hope. If, now, San Salvador had not been already discovered, we might at present all be wondering why

we are not called Cabralians instead of Americans. Only it so happened that San Salvador had been actually discovered. The sky fell a little before Cabral's time, and so Columbus caught the larks. Let him by all means keep them.

Mr. Winsor shows that the discovery makes even now a greater stir in our minds than it appears to have made, outside of a few limited circles, at the time when the caravels sailed back into Palos. The animated and brilliant picture which Irving draws of the reception in Barcelona hardly reappears in the annals of Barcelona, or in other chronicles of the time. It was an interesting thing, indeed, to learn that the islands off the coast of Cathay had been reached in fact, as wise men had so often opined that they might be. But why should the world be shaken over a discovery of which Seneca had had so much better a premonition than the very man who himself had caused "Ocean to relax his bonds, and a new world to arise beyond the Western main," and who did not know, and never would consent to know, what he had done when he had done it? Even when he finally discovered the continent of South America (which it seems reasonably certain that Vesputius had not done before him), he wavered between Paradise and Cathay, but would know nothing of a *Novus Mundus*. It seems that Ferdinand Columbus, after his father's death, regarded South America as quite a distinct thing from the great and original discovery, and did not complain that this secondary find should bear the particular name of America. There never was a more innocent or less contested usurpation until, towards 1550, good Las Casas suddenly waked up and protested too late — knowing now that *Noster Seneca* had here at least proved canonical — that the New World "ought to be called Columba."

Mr. Winsor would evidently not have had the slightest objection if Lief Ericsson had discovered America, or if he had instructed Columbus how to do so. But he holds it doubtful whether Columbus, in his one northern voyage, touched Iceland; and if he did, whether he learned anything of these Vinland voyages; and if he did, whether they signified much to him. Greenland is put down in the maps of the time as an immense extension of northern Russia or Scandinavia, and it would not have meant much to Columbus to learn that it was a few days' journey longer or shorter. They tell us now that Labrador is as far as Lief can have gone. Certain it is, that when later Columbus had all occasion to summon every authority, he said nothing about this, and of course he did not expect to find Vinland by sailing southwest.

The biographer, it seems to us, draws a rather harsh inference, in concluding, from the indifference with which the news of the great discoverer's death was received, to his unworthiness of being remembered. Surely the attention which that "king in disguise," known as To-day, receives, is in very uncertain proportion to his intrinsic rank. Certainly Columbus has not suffered from any lack of attention now that it can do him no good. Still, we will not in the least dispute that what he *was* stood much below the level of what he *did*, and that to the great gift of aspiration the great gift of lofty constancy of noble endeavor was not added for him.

"The soul of man is adequate to gain
Heights which it is not adequate to keep,"

seems to have been emphatically true of this character.

We think, however, that it is possible he might ask : " In this year, of all years, might I not perhaps have enjoyed from a son of the New World a somewhat milder presentation of my many and grievous faults, and a somewhat more cordial acknowledgment of my supreme achievement ? "

The ups and downs of the Admiral's reputation in the hands of biographers are very divertingly told. We doubt whether the present biographer has found quite the line of no variation. His person and countenance seem to be as little of a fixity as his character. Mr. Winsor, however, allows us to believe him of impressive demeanor and appearance, and of that complexion which, in a Genoese, suggests Teutonic blood. He gives us all the portraits, and we may choose our Columbus for ourselves. Even Prescott's Ferdinand and Isabella are contended with considerable reason to be only ideal faces founded on loose remembrances after portrait-painting had become more common in Spain. As to birth, we are happy in being finally allowed to believe, what was once supposed, that the discoverer was born in Genoa. Not seven, but seventeen cities, have contended for the honor of his nativity, and we can only gratify them all by assuming an original pluripresence, and so canonizing him *ab initio*.

The character of Columbus is seen to singular disadvantage when contrasted with the far-reaching plans, lofty simplicity, and magnificent self-devotion of Prince Henry of Portugal, the father of modern discovery, whose agents were men of like self-forgetting and heroic mould with himself.

The portraits, and pictures, and diagrams, and above all the maps, with which the book is sown, take us through all the stages of conjectural, incipient, unfolding, and completed discovery.

There seems to be very fair reason for believing that Columbus is, after all, buried in Havana.

Charles C. Starbuck.

ANDOVER.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Houghton, Mifflin & Co., Boston and New York. The Unseen Friend. By Lucy Larcom. Pp. xi, 217. 1892. \$1.00. — Personality. Sermons by Samuel Richard Fuller, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Malden, Mass. Pp. 302. 1892. \$1.25.

Roberts Brothers, Boston. West Roxbury Sermons. By Theodore Parker. 1837-1848. From Unpublished Manuscripts. With Introduction and Biographical Sketch. Pp. xxiii, 235. \$1.00.

Henry Holt & Co., New York. Series of Modern Philosophers. Edited by E. Hershey Sneath, Ph. D. The Philosophy of Spinoza, as contained in the First, Second, and Fifth Parts of the "Ethics," and in Extracts from the Third and Fourth. Translated from the Latin, and Edited with Notes, by George Stuart Fullerton, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Pennsylvania. Pp. vi, 204. 1892. Teacher's price, \$1.20. For sale by C. Schoenhof, Boston.

The Baker & Taylor Co., New York; Hart & Co., Toronto. The New Empire. Reflections upon its Origin and Constitution and its Relation to the Great Republic. By O. A. Howland, of Osgoode Hall, Barrister-at-Law. Pp. xix, 608. 1891. \$2.50.

Macmillan & Co., New York and London. The Soteriology of the New Testament. By William Porcher Du Bose, M. A., S. T. D., Professor of Exegesis in the University of the South. Pp. vi, 391. 1892. \$1.50.

